

ISH6_31 March_PT2

Created on: 2023-03-31 11:34:07

Project Length: 01:09:46

File Name: ISH6_31 March_PT2

File Length: 01:09:46

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:10 - 00:00:27:01

Good morning. It is now 11:50 a.m. and am resuming issue specific hearing six session two. We will move on to agenda item four in just a minute. But before that, i believe we have a few people who've joined us during the break. Could i request a introductions, please?

00:00:35:10 - 00:00:39:29

Boolean puzzle for the applicant, and we've got a new member of our team who will introduce herself.

00:00:42:12 - 00:00:49:06

Good morning. Samantha Westwood and I work for a consultancy called Anna Tech, who specialize in shipping and navigation.

00:00:49:27 - 00:00:52:21

Okay. Thank you. Um.

00:00:54:16 - 00:00:59:23

And do we have an attendee from Chamber of Shipping? Can see a hand up. Sorry. I can't see who it is.

00:01:01:17 - 00:01:08:29

Good morning. Yes, Robert Merrill is here from the Chamber of Shipping, the trade association for the commercial shipping industry. Thank you.

00:01:09:10 - 00:01:13:00

Thank you. Is there anybody else who's joined us?

00:01:23:16 - 00:01:24:06

Good morning.

00:01:25:03 - 00:01:29:00

Morning. My name is Nick Salter. I'm representing the Maritime Coastguard Agency.

00:01:30:15 - 00:01:36:26

Okay. Thank you. Have representatives from Jonas Seafood joined us yet?

00:01:39:27 - 00:01:42:20

No. So have an empty seat beside.

00:01:43:03 - 00:01:50:26

No worries. Thank you very much. Okay, Without further ado, I am going to hand over to Mr. Rennie for agenda item four.

00:01:54:03 - 00:02:18:09

Okay. So shipping and navigation. Welcome back, everybody. I trust you all refreshed. Um, we're now going to commence this session with agenda item four for shipping and navigation. Um, firstly, I've got some questions for the Marine and Coastguard agency, the MCA. Um, a few questions I'd like to have them respond to. Are they now.

00:02:18:23 - 00:02:20:01

Julian Boswell for the applicant?

00:02:21:25 - 00:02:42:11

Would it be possible for us to set the scene for this? Because building on we've asked for this to potentially run on, We think it's really important that you understand how we've got to where we are now. And as Westwood has prepared a sort of a summary of that, we think it's really important that you understand the context and how we've got here.

00:02:43:13 - 00:02:43:28

Okay.

00:02:58:29 - 00:02:59:14

Mm.

00:03:00:21 - 00:03:17:02

Okay. What we'd like to do is just initially, just ask a few basic questions for the Marine and Coast Guard agency based on the plans just to set it up that so we understand what those issues are. And then you're more than welcome then to come in with your points about the sort of.

00:03:18:00 - 00:03:41:24

Did you mention Julian Boswell? Did you mention the plans just then? Yes. Can we just say on that that we. We hadn't seen those before They went in and there was a meeting on Friday with the MTA where it was agreed that submitting those plans might not actually assist the examination because they might oversimplify things. So it just wanted to to, to mention that.

00:03:42:20 - 00:03:47:18

But Mr. Boswell, can I just confirm that you've seen the plans now? They were published on the website yesterday.

00:03:47:20 - 00:03:49:22

Yes, we have, but we didn't see them in advance.

00:03:52:02 - 00:04:01:20

No, that's that's the same time that we received and think was around that sort of time. Um, but yes, if I could just go to the Moon and Coastguard agency just initially, Mr. Salter.

00:04:05:06 - 00:04:05:21

Yes. Hello.

00:04:07:22 - 00:04:15:24

Um. First of all, just some basic questions. Would you regard the area of the proposed wind farm extensions to be a busy shipping lane or route generally?

00:04:17:00 - 00:04:19:11

Yes, we would consider it to be a busy area.

00:04:20:27 - 00:04:29:16

And is it correct that in practice commercial ship and wooden travel through the actual wind farms, they would go in between all round?

00:04:30:19 - 00:04:33:03

Generally, that is the accepted practice. Yes.

00:04:36:05 - 00:05:21:24

Okay. Thank you. Um, we are grateful to receive the three plans which were published on our website yesterday, I think is referenced as zero 44 from the MTA. Um, and we now know that the applicant has had a view of this. Um, firstly, with regard to the main corridor through the dudgeon and sheringham wind farms. Firstly, uh, just to clarify with the Marine and Coast Guard agency currently there's a corridor that you would consider, um, through dudgeon and sharing and wind farms of 8.2 nautical miles width with this due to approximate 1.50 command buffers, most shipping traffic through the corridor is within about a 5.2 nautical mile width.

00:05:21:26 - 00:05:23:14

Is that essentially correct?

00:05:23:18 - 00:05:25:27

Yes, that's correct. Okay.

00:05:26:22 - 00:05:54:07

And so with the proposed development, um, taking, I think a reduced buffer of one nautical mile, they would be a remaining corridor width of 3.6 nautical miles. Um, can you let me know why you would maybe consider that, first of all, to be too narrow? Is this to do with the type of shipping traffic through the route or the length of the resultant corridor, etcetera?

00:05:56:13 - 00:06:29:26

Uh, except for the Maritime Coastguard agency. The images are there to represent the narrowing of the channel. It's not there to represent an unacceptable width of the channel, but it's just used to highlight the broader discussion on the increasing collision risk. I'd also point out that the one nautical mile buffer that there is a minimum one nautical mile and generally they do vessels do transit 1.5 miles away from from from the.

00:06:31:08 - 00:06:31:23

Hmm.

00:06:32:08 - 00:06:46:05

Okay. Um, but other than that, the, the figures, they're about 3.6 nautical miles would be about correct in terms of the the corridor that would be remaining if the extensions were provided.

00:06:46:09 - 00:06:47:11

Yes, that's correct.

00:06:47:17 - 00:07:14:26

Okay. Um, and lastly, before we come back to the applicant, um, can you explain the sort of guidance where you can calculate a minimum width of corridor needed for these certain circumstances? There's mention of guidance being used. And from this, what would you consider the width of the sea corridor that you would wish to see to provide adequate safety? Is that would that be no less than existing, for example?

00:07:20:23 - 00:07:22:20

So. So was that towards me or to the applicant?

00:07:24:00 - 00:07:26:12

My. Sorry. Did you hear the question? Yeah.

00:07:26:14 - 00:07:27:26

Was that directed towards me? Yes.

00:07:27:28 - 00:07:30:11

Yes, it was. Yeah. Sorry. Yes. Sorry.

00:07:30:18 - 00:07:31:25

Could you repeat the question?

00:07:31:27 - 00:07:52:14

Yeah, sure. Um, just basically, can you explain the sort of guidance that you would use to to calculate a, say, for example, minimum width of a corridor needed for certain circumstances? And from this, what would be the minimum C width of C corridor that you would seek in this circumstance to provide the adequate safety?

00:07:54:20 - 00:08:01:08

So there's corridor guidance within guidance six, five, four. And that

00:08:03:02 - 00:08:39:19

basis, the width of the the required width of a corridor to be proportionate to the length. Right. Using using a 20 degree. 20 degree angle of the length. Now, in this instance, the length of the corridor. Uh. Has been taken from from the edge of Sheringham shoulder, the northern northern edge. But there is an argument to say that it could be extended to the to the to the West Asian boy because because of the nature of the navigational conditions.

00:08:39:21 - 00:08:53:22

So the the image that was that was provided as well as is has just been used to highlight the overall picture. But generally the guidance within the

00:08:55:20 - 00:08:59:07

states that over five nautical miles is acceptable.

00:09:00:23 - 00:09:11:13

Over five nautical miles is acceptable. That's right. Yeah. Okay. And so therefore, you have a concern that this has been reduced to 3.2. Would that be fair?

00:09:12:05 - 00:09:17:12

Uh, well, it would. It would include the safety buffers as well. So.

00:09:19:29 - 00:09:23:17

So with the safety buffers, that would be 5.6.

00:09:23:24 - 00:09:24:15

That's right. Yeah.

00:09:25:01 - 00:09:34:09

Okay. So from a corridor guidance perspective, would would this the remaining corridor still be at an acceptable level?

00:09:35:21 - 00:09:42:16

Following mean strictly speaking, if you're following the guidance, then then yes, it does comply with that. Okay.

00:09:50:06 - 00:10:29:19

Think there was comments within your submission that let me just get the right one in front of me. Um. That it is arguable the length of the corridor should be 17.2 nautical miles and the required width as per the guidance in 654 would be at least 6.25 nautical miles. So, um, is that to do with a consideration of the, the the length of the corridor or is that is that guidance compared to minimum? What's the difference between the five nautical miles and the 6.25 that you mentioned previously? Well, that's.

00:10:29:21 - 00:10:37:18

Just going by using the calculations within the guidance. Um, and where the length of the corridor is measured from.

00:10:39:13 - 00:10:39:28

Right.

00:10:42:03 - 00:10:46:06

Um. Okay. Can I come back to the applicant on those points, please?

00:10:49:00 - 00:11:03:05

Julian Boswell for the applicant. We would really like to set the scene with the statement that was westward as promised, and then I will leave it to her as to how to deal with the points that have come up in the questions just raised.

00:11:03:20 - 00:11:04:23

Okay. Yes, sure.

00:11:06:12 - 00:11:40:25

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. And I think probably some of the answers were given there and some of your responses probably give a good example of how this is a complex area. And by focusing on a calculation which does not in isolation, answer the question as to whether these developments in situ are is an oversimplification of the process. I therefore wanted to take you through the navigational risk assessment and that's 198, which is similar to the evidence plan approach taken by other chapters, but it's specific to the shipping and navigational remit.

00:11:40:27 - 00:12:11:15

So we have quite specific guidance that we follow in terms of that navigational risk assessment, which is marine guidance notes six five for the navigational risk assessment is a process, not just the document that we submit as part of the application. It is also a sum of all of the consultation, baseline data gathering, modeling and assessment through the 4 to 5 years that we've been looking at this project. The statement is not the decision of any one person or party, but the output of that work undertaken.

00:12:12:14 - 00:12:55:07

A key part of that navigational risk assessment process is the consultation which commenced in this project in 2018 and has continued through the Pre-application process, including pre and post scoping section 42 consultation. That and Pre-application consultation, as Mr. Boswell alluded to, up until

meetings still being undertaken last week, 1 to 1 meetings were also undertaken with regular operators. The Hazard Workshop in 2021, which a number of key parties including the attended and just for information that has a workshop, is the process by which we create the hazard log and which again is a key input into the process that the risk or the impact assessment.

00:12:56:14 - 00:13:29:00

Section 42 is also a key part of that process. And this is a dry run in terms of the navigational risk assessment and the feedback typically from operators or ports from that process is fed into the navigational risk assessment. So just be clear, we submit a draft or for this project, we submitted a draft navigational risk assessment at Section 42 and we then get comments and feedback on that. We look then at additional work or mitigations and needed, and then we submit an application, a navigational risk assessment as part of the application.

00:13:29:15 - 00:13:31:09

Once we reach the stage

00:13:32:27 - 00:14:26:27

to confirm the is also agreed as part of the statement to common ground process that the navigational risk assessment has been undertaken in line with marine guidance. Note 654, including a completion of a checklist which demonstrates where and how the applicant has met those requirements. The checklist was also submitted alongside the draft at section 42 and that included collision risk modelling results. Whilst I have been questions raised, of course with any application through the process until a few weeks ago, we had not received any feedback in relation to DEP North that we felt had not been addressed by the process, including ongoing consultation with the Chamber of Shipping over their cumulative rating concerns, but also direct with operators in the area who were concerned about deviations around project vessels operating between the sites.

00:14:26:29 - 00:15:02:08

That consultation resulted in a bespoke mitigation being developed. The navigational management plan a perfect example of how the Section 42 process is meant to work, as Mr. Boswell alluded to earlier. We made a statement at the last hearing, the 18th of January, where we believed everything was on track in terms of agreement on shipping and navigational issues. Therefore, we were surprised to receive the draft statement of Common Ground and the written representations from the on the 6th of February suggesting that a reduction in the red line boundary of DEP north was necessary.

00:15:02:18 - 00:15:42:17

This reduction, we would believe, would not make any material difference to the collision risk result, especially as demonstrated by the the majority of that risk is associated with the conservative increases in traffic volume, not the presence of the wind farm. We undertook the specialist in shipping and navigation and the applicant would not have submitted the navigational risk assessment if we believe that navigational safety risk remained. And to my knowledge, no new evidence has come to light that demonstrates that that statement has changed and that the navigational risk assessment has not successfully successfully mitigated the risk to shipping and navigation in this area.

00:15:42:29 - 00:15:43:15

Thank you.

00:15:44:20 - 00:15:52:06

Thank you. Um, do you also want to maybe come back more directly to what you heard from Mr. Salter?

00:15:54:20 - 00:16:25:08

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. Yes. Just to reiterate that point, though, that I think focusing on the calculations, the corridor calculation in particular is an oversimplification of the process. The 20 degree calculation, as noted in 654, is to be assessed between an area that is bounded by turbines. So that is why within the navigational risk assessment, we have drawn it within the area where there are turbines on either side of that shipping route.

00:16:26:11 - 00:16:57:06

The 1.5 nautical mile passing distance we also feel is related to waypoints in the area. So two points where a ship would choose to navigate through, they obviously travel in the easiest route for them, which actually keeps them 1.5 nautical miles off Sheringham. But actually, in reality, evidence over the years from existing wind farm shows that excuse me, vessels are comfortable getting one nautical mile and closer, depending on the conditions, depending on the type of the vessel.

00:16:57:08 - 00:17:27:15

Therefore, the 1.5 nautical mile excuse me, the 1.4, 1.5 nautical miles. Setback distance is very specific to that location. I know there was also reference to try to Knoll and a 1.5 nautical mile setback from that. But again, at the time that the traffic surveys and the navigational risk assessment was done, there was construction voyage in place that try and know, which obviously increases the setback for vessels keeping clear of the the red line boundary area.

00:17:29:04 - 00:17:36:15

So there's no particular regulation to say that that shipping has to be more than one nautical mile away from a wind farm.

00:17:38:13 - 00:17:57:26

That's correct. It's for the master of any vessels decision to decide how close they pass to the wind farm. Obviously, there is guidance out there about being a prudent mariner, but it would be for them to decide, depending on the type of vessel they're on, the maneuvering capabilities and the conditions, the weather conditions, for example, at the time.

00:17:59:10 - 00:17:59:27

Okay.

00:18:00:16 - 00:18:05:02

Um, can I come back to Mr. Salter on what you heard at that point?

00:18:08:29 - 00:18:29:09

Mix also for the maritime coastguard and see on the on the point of the distance between whether it's one nautical mile or 1.5. There is evidence around the where that distance is between 1 and 1.5 depending on depending on the vessel type, as Mrs. Westford has stated.

00:18:35:06 - 00:19:05:19

I'd also like to make a point on the consultation comments that were made. But I'd also like to point out that in June 2021, at the Section 42 stage, that the there was still a 14 day traffic survey still to be undertaken and the Hazard workshop hadn't yet been undertaken. So we didn't have the full picture, we didn't have the draft entry was and wasn't complete.

00:19:07:27 - 00:19:32:21

Mr. SALTER Can I just jump in with a few specific questions relating to what the applicant has stated? Um, one thing that the applicant has just said that the all up assessment cannot be made by one party. Could you respond to that point? And, and if it is, if it is indeed true that it cannot be made by one party, then how is that conclusion or finding reached?

00:19:34:02 - 00:20:02:11

With the statement of whether a risk assessment is tolerable. And then in brackets, if a lot is made by the applicant and it is for the navigation stakeholders to to to decide to decide whether or not that is a reasonable conclusion. So it is for the applicant to to receive that feedback from the navigation consultees.

00:20:05:12 - 00:20:12:26

That's helpful. And I'll come back with any further questions that have on that a bit later. The second question was that, um.

00:20:15:21 - 00:20:54:00

And that the point the applicant made and you've kind of alluded to that, is that until a few weeks ago, no concerns had been raised by yourself. And you've said that in June of 2021 there was some traffic survey still pending, so you didn't have a full picture. So I think you're starting to address that point. But just give us a little bit more about what might have happened, Um, in order for, uh, for, you know, in since then, that has meant that there's been a diversion in between yourselves and the applicant on this assessment and conclusion.

00:20:55:18 - 00:21:09:12

Well, the first time we saw the the finalized with all the all the inputting data was at the deadline one stage. Um, when we submitted our comments.

00:21:11:18 - 00:21:16:08

Okay, I understand that. And I'll come back to the applicant on that in a second. Um.

00:21:25:24 - 00:21:27:00

Bear with me one minute.

00:21:30:20 - 00:21:52:02

There was a statement made by yourself. Um, and just correct me if I'm right. Right. That. It's your understanding that it is the traffic volume, which is the issue with the risk assessment rather than the the position of the projects. Did I understand that correctly?

00:21:53:09 - 00:22:25:00

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. So what was trying to explain there is within the navigational risk assessment, we undertake modelling of different scenarios and as required by 654, that's base case, base case with the wind farm base case plus 10% base case plus 10% with the wind farm and so on up to 20%. And actually when you look at the collision risk results within the navigational risk assessment, what you will see is that that change is associated with the estimated increases of traffic.

00:22:25:02 - 00:22:43:06

So the 10% increase, even without DEP and CIP in situ, would still include increase the collision risk value and again 20%, which is an extremely conservative value. That's a 20% increase across all vessel types, would again be the majority of the increase rather than the inclusion of DEP and CEP.

00:22:43:10 - 00:22:50:11

And is it reasonable to assume that increase in volume without and DEP? So in terms of that baseline.

00:22:50:29 - 00:23:17:10

Um, Samantha Westwood for the applicant, traditionally over the years we've always modeled 10% as we feel that is a realistic value depending on the area. But recent applications have requested that we increase that to 20% as kind of a measure, if you like, so that then you can use it as a scale to see how the risk would change. So yes, by current standards that is typical to us. Also assume a 20% increase.

00:23:19:18 - 00:23:26:19

Um, would you like to just come back on the point that Mr. Salters made that the full picture was.

00:23:31:09 - 00:23:49:16

No, that's fine. So would you just respond to Mr. Salter's point that the full picture was only made available to us at deadline one when all the assessments were submitted into examination. And so wouldn't it be reasonable at this point for him to have for to have that concern raised?

00:23:51:13 - 00:24:27:27

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. So just to pick up on the draft that was submitted at Pier, that did include 12 months additional data. And just to be clear for everybody, this data does include all of commercial vessel traffic. So we actually had an improved picture of vessels were doing at that time, both over the minimum of 28 days of dedicated survey data that was available. But also we did submit a pre-submission copy of the final navigational risk assessment to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency in July 20th, 22nd July 2022.

00:24:29:06 - 00:24:33:16

Um, and just one point something that Mr.. Boswell.

00:24:36:29 - 00:24:37:15

No.

00:24:38:00 - 00:24:39:01

Do you need a minute?

00:24:52:24 - 00:25:15:16

Mr. Boswell alluded to the images that have been submitted which are now in the examination library. These images were requested on based on the submission that had made. We we requested that for the hearing just to have um, a plan in front of us. What are your concerns about that? Is it to do with the oversimplification that you refer to in Europe right now?

00:25:16:17 - 00:25:52:28

Samantha Westwood for the applicant? That's correct. We're trying to apply a mathematical calculation, if you like, to a area that does not suit it. And whilst, you know, the corridor has been extended beyond where the turbines bound the route, if we applied that policy to everything, that you could keep going on making that corridor longer and longer. So really it's trying to apply maths to a more complicated problem. And what we really wanted to emphasize was that the navigational risk assessment, with all the work that we've done, you know, has gone beyond that and has addressed and picked up all of those points.

00:25:53:12 - 00:26:14:12

Okay, I'm going to come back to that. I have a suggestion, but I just want to bring Mr. Salter in. And can you respond to that point about it being oversimplification and perhaps the point that applicants also made about the corridor being longer than is reasonable? Why have you chosen that length?

00:26:17:18 - 00:26:53:13

So Nick Salter from the Maritime Coastguard Agency. I agree with Mrs. Westwood that we. That is an oversimplification, isn't it? We've included it to just paint the paint the overall picture of our concerns for broad collision risk. Um. The corridor could be. There is an argument to extend the corridor up to the to the west because of the navigational features and the shallow water vessels would not be deviating south west of that point.

00:26:53:29 - 00:27:00:16

Um, so it's been used just to highlight our concerns that collision risk.

00:27:03:00 - 00:27:05:04

Own concerns on collision risk.

00:27:06:27 - 00:27:08:13

Okay. Okay. Thank you.

00:27:40:07 - 00:28:06:16

And I think what we were going to suggest is for the applicant to maybe come back to us with a response to the comments from the MTA. And I think there were some comments as well in the Chamber of Shipping. Um, maybe as well if you've got any updated diagrams or something like that you wanted to submit, um,

00:28:08:07 - 00:28:16:05

to uh, for us to look alongside what's been submitted by the MTA. Think that would be useful? Um.

00:28:27:27 - 00:28:48:10

And so, yeah, we were just going to ask. Um, other than that, is there, um, what would be the sort of next steps for yourself in terms of. Would it be further negotiation with the, for example, or um, are we looking at a statement of common ground with them, for example, to be updated or submitted?

00:28:51:12 - 00:29:33:06

Julian Boswell for the applicant. Guess our current problem is that we we really don't understand why the has changed its position. And as far as we can see, it has changed its position. And we and we think that the conclusion of the stand the next issue is that we don't think, as as Mrs. Westwood said in her summary, we don't think that the the proposed mitigation, i.e. reducing the red line, would make a material difference because obviously, clearly, normally where there's a problem and there is an essential solution, then you, you know, you can debate the problem.

00:29:33:08 - 00:29:46:17

But if you can accept the mitigation, then sometimes you can move to the mitigation, even if you don't believe that you have to. Here the stakes are quite high. Um, and to the point where we, we, you know,

00:29:48:04 - 00:30:26:25

we think we may need another hearing on this. That is kind of teed up on a, on a, on a fuller basis. Um, because if the red line boundary is changed and that's not something we've spent any time looking at at this point in any detail, um, that is, that is a significant, that is potentially a significant factor for, for the project. And so as Mrs. Westwood has, has, has, has outlined, we have engaged with a range of parties, Trinity House, Chamber of shipping, um, specific port operators and so on.

00:30:26:27 - 00:31:05:28

And we've, we've reached, you know, we've done everything that we are supposed to do when she said, I hope you got the feeling in her voice when she explained that you do not submit unless you think you've got everything sorted out. You don't do that in for windfarm applications. And we were comfortable and confident that we had got that sorted out. And that is why that's why we submitted. So in terms of it, yes, of course we'll continue to engage with with the. But but what we're hoping is that that we can get back to where we thought we were in terms of in terms of the navigation risk assessment.

00:31:06:09 - 00:31:06:24

I think.

00:31:07:05 - 00:31:41:14

Sorry. I think the the point is, I mean, we've got the comments now from, uh, the, the Coast Guard agency, um, and, and the plans as well. I think from your perspective, it seems that you're still quite confident that there isn't a materially increased or there wouldn't be a significantly increased collision risk. And I think just to maybe just respond to the, uh, the comments from the, um, and, and then we can sort of maybe move forward from that point.

00:31:42:07 - 00:31:42:22

Um.

00:31:59:06 - 00:32:20:14

Um, could I just come back to Mr. Salt, though, on one point that was raised by the applicant with a suggestion that even if the red line was reduced and therefore maybe creating some extra width of the corridor, that wouldn't make any material difference to collision risk.

00:32:21:09 - 00:32:23:02

They got your response in that, Mr. Salter?

00:32:23:19 - 00:32:24:04

Yeah.

00:32:26:20 - 00:32:48:03

We feel it would. And our concerns are chiefly around the the northern site of Dudgeon extension and within the navigable sea room between the northern site and and try no in that north west south east direction.

00:32:50:06 - 00:33:22:05

Okay. Um, could I just move on just to ask a couple of questions about that particular aspect? Um, both the plan and written statement. State that the existing width is approximately 2.5 nautical miles on that corridor around that sort of western edge of, uh, dudgeon or the existing dudgeon wind farm. Um, the plan seems to show this being reduced to about 2.3 nautical miles because of the extension being proposed, which which sort of pushes in slightly to the, uh, the corridor.

00:33:22:19 - 00:33:36:14

Um, but then with the buffer included, that would be reduced to around 1.3 nautical miles remaining. Um, is, first of all, is that correct? My interpretation of, of what you've, what you, what you've suggested would be the case.

00:33:37:20 - 00:33:43:26

Yes. The point being that the traffic is squeezed into a corridor. That width? Yeah.

00:33:44:14 - 00:33:57:03

About 1.3 nautical miles. Okay. Um, I think the written representation says it's going to be approximately one nautical mile, and the plan was 1.3 nautical miles. Is there any particular difference with that?

00:33:57:14 - 00:34:04:10

Um, yeah, just depends on on that safety buffer distance that is being used.

00:34:06:06 - 00:34:06:25

I see.

00:34:07:14 - 00:34:32:27

Okay. And, um, it's shown this the. I think the applicant referred to this as well. They're a 1.5 nautical mile clearance from Triton. Null. Would it would it be acceptable for one nautical mile to be from Triton null? Would that be realistic or reasonable? I think it's still shown as 1.5 on the plan, isn't it?

00:34:34:04 - 00:34:47:28

That's right. Yeah. Um, I refer back to it. Come from Mrs. Westwood is down to the to the vessels and the vessel masters themselves. But there are, there are other features to the north that are

00:34:49:25 - 00:34:50:25

influencing that.

00:34:52:00 - 00:34:53:13

Ice and stand. Um.

00:35:12:21 - 00:35:13:06

Um.

00:35:14:20 - 00:35:15:18

Looking at.

00:35:20:03 - 00:35:52:06

Just looking at that aspect as well. It was just struck me that what you've got at the moment past Brighton all is about 2.5 nautical miles width. Um, and the corridor that you've shown as resulting from the extensions at Sheringham and Dudgeon between the two windfarms would be 3.6. Does the fact that you've got 2.5 nautical miles past Triton, all as existing, suggests that maybe 3.6 between the the wind farms of Sheringham and Dudgeon would be actually acceptable from a safety perspective.

00:35:55:26 - 00:36:03:15

Because 2.5 is existing, isn't it? I believe, as you've as you've indicated, around the western edge of north.

00:36:05:06 - 00:36:07:07

Yeah. It's the fault. Sorry.

00:36:07:09 - 00:36:21:25

Apologies for the. It's the volume of traffic as well. Is divided and converges into the area between Dudgeon and Sheringham. So? So the volume of traffic has an impact on collision risk.

00:36:23:01 - 00:36:41:09

Right. So would there be less volume heading round Dudgeon West where you've got that 2.5 nautical mile gap at the moment between the two wind farms? Would the traffic split, are you suggesting so there would be less traffic going in that sort of northern route past that western edge? Yeah.

00:36:41:11 - 00:36:45:10

The traffic splits to to pass to the west and east of trying. No.

00:36:46:02 - 00:36:52:04

Okay. Okay. Thank you. Could I just come back to the applicant on those those particular points?

00:36:53:17 - 00:37:28:04

Amanda Westwood for the applicant just to pick up there in terms of the question about collision risk and how that would change with any reduction to debt North. Think it's really important that we focus on those collision risk values in the navigational risk assessment, accounting for collision risk in the entirety of the study area. So that's a ten nautical mile buffer around both projects and approximately only 14% of that collision risk relates to the area in proximity to DEP north, and we'd be happy to submit a figure explaining this in further detail.

00:37:28:23 - 00:37:59:18

I guess another point for me to pick up there is one of the things that are also include one of the areas beg your pardon that also is included within that study area is a channel between docking shoal and race bank to the south of the Sheringham project. And that area actually contributes to 16% of the collision risk and is actually only at its narrowest is 1.2 nautical miles wide. And I think that's a good demonstration that this is a complex area.

00:37:59:20 - 00:38:37:20

There are a lot of vessels navigating in this area, but based on accident and incident statistics, they are able to do that safely with the international regulations for the prevention of collisions at sea, coal regs and with other regulations such as So last, the safety of life at sea, which includes passage planning requirements. They are able to safely navigate in these areas as long as the information is provided to them to do those passage plans, which is the embedded mitigations that we've got within the navigational risk assessment, the lighting and marking, for example, the charting of the wind farms.

00:38:38:10 - 00:39:11:21

I understand just back to the Marine coastguard agency for, um, towards the final question on this really is, is what would be necessary to ensure the development would not result in safety issues due to collision due to restricted sea room taking into account with three months into the examination period at the moment. Um is the if the red line wasn't altered in some way to change the sea room in between the wind farms.

00:39:12:01 - 00:39:24:29

Um, we've heard about the embedded mitigation as well that the applicant has put forward. Is there anything else that you would wish to see, um, which could help the situation from your perspective?

00:39:26:27 - 00:39:27:14

Excels for the.

00:39:30:15 - 00:39:45:16

Like, say our chief concern is that, um that red line boundary or to to an extension north site. And at present our concerns are the available serum and so.

00:39:47:12 - 00:39:59:01

I think there is only one one mitigation which which is possible as far as we're concerned, which is which would be to reduce that boundary further to the east.

00:40:00:07 - 00:40:02:06

Mhm. I understand. Okay.

00:40:02:24 - 00:40:08:24

Um, could just bring in your chamber of shipping if you've got any comments on what you might have heard today.

00:40:14:02 - 00:40:18:23

Robert Mireles for Chamber of Shipping. Thank you. Um.

00:40:20:22 - 00:40:55:15

Broadly speaking, over the course of the period of engagement and consultation with the. With the applicant and with and as navigational risk consultants. Um, the Chamber and its membership have been brought along on that journey wholeheartedly and with good engagement. Uh, we raised concerns around the northern extent of debt at the Crown Estate leasing process in 2018. We raised further concerns about it at section 42, uh, in 2021.

00:40:55:26 - 00:41:28:10

Um, and we'll be supportive of a drawing in perhaps of the red line boundary, um, there or some commitment, Um. A commitment to not necessarily develop to the full extent of the project design envelope. The Chamber also raised comments to the effect of the corridor calculation in its Section 42 response from 2021.

00:41:28:25 - 00:41:48:15

And as you have commented upon so far this morning, this is a matter for ongoing discussion between the applicant and the Chamber of Shipping regarding interpretation of corridor calculation and specifically in narrow interpretation of the MTA guidance within 654.

00:41:50:05 - 00:42:24:25

Okay. Thank you. Um, can I just add another question of yourself, please? Um, National policy statement three at paragraph 2.6.162 states that the site selection should be made with a view to avoiding or minimizing disruption, disruption or economic loss to the shipping and navigation industry. Does the chamber ship and believe that the site and other wind farm achieves this? Um, I'm considering here about the narrowing of sea room. For instance. Would ships divert from the area? Would that result in longer journey distances, more disruption and economic cost, for example?

00:42:29:03 - 00:42:35:15

I do not think that the. No, Sorry. Can you repeat the question? Sorry.

00:42:36:21 - 00:43:08:05

Yeah, it was just within the national policy statement. It says that the site selection should be made with a view to avoiding or minimizing disruption or economic loss of shipping and navigation industries. Um, so I was just looking to get your feel for how this might affect shipping. Um, for example, would ships potentially divert from the area resulting in longer journey distances, more disruption or increased economic cost, for example?

00:43:11:26 - 00:43:30:09

There will be some minor deviation caused by the development of the wind farm that was raised within by members of the Chamber of Shipping and by the Chamber of Shipping during the consultation process. The extent of that deviation is not necessarily

00:43:31:24 - 00:44:12:14

extensive or large from a commercial perspective. Um, with regard to the safety, um, considerations around loss of navigable serum. Um, it is and has been written within the Chamber's consultation response up to date that there are, um, have been concerned that that. The on a if I may, to a earlier point, and that is that the representation of the chamber made to the Crown Estate in November 2018, when these Crown estate extensions for around three projects were first proposed.

00:44:13:16 - 00:44:14:26

Okay. Thank you.

00:44:15:16 - 00:44:26:08

Um, and just also wondering if there's any comment now. Um, thank you. Mr. Mirrlees from Trinity House, on what you've heard today.

00:44:27:14 - 00:44:28:26

To do the shipping for the area.

00:44:31:27 - 00:45:06:15

Thank you to Tom McNamara for Trinity House. I don't think we have any substantive point to make in addition to those that we've heard. Um, I will let Captain Harris at any points, but clearly it will be helpful for us to understand the applicant's response to. And the submissions that the made at deadline one and in particular the the plan that MTA have submitted in advance of this hearing. Um, I don't know if Captain Harris has anything else else to say at this point, though.

00:45:07:25 - 00:45:19:27

Okay. Captain Harris, to our Harris Trinity House. No, sir. Not really. Got much else to add in that to what's already been said by the applicants and the tech and the

00:45:21:16 - 00:45:43:15

as we recognized in the previous hearing, Trinity House to acknowledge there will be an increase in risk due to the compression of the traffic and it depends on how that is mitigated. Yes, until we see further details and what comes out of the conversation between the applicant and the. I don't think we've got any further comments to make.

00:45:44:03 - 00:45:45:18

That's fair enough. Thank you very much.

00:45:48:02 - 00:45:48:17

That's true.

00:45:50:07 - 00:45:57:27

So thank you very much. Um, just jumping in here. Um, been thinking this this through, and I'm not necessarily.

00:45:58:11 - 00:46:02:05

Agreeing or disagreeing with anyone, but it's a question for the, for the applicant.

00:46:02:07 - 00:46:03:05

Really.

00:46:03:07 - 00:46:39:03

And in light of the, the ongoing concerns in instead of changing the red line boundary. Could the applicant um, commit perhaps to a a commitment to their layout not to place a turbine within x nautical miles of the red line boundary edge? Um, I'm sure it's not your intention to place a turbine right on the red line boundary itself. But would that amendment to a buffer within the red line solve the issue of moving the red line at all?

00:46:39:08 - 00:46:43:05

Just a just a thought. Julian Boswell for the applicant.

00:46:44:22 - 00:47:12:02

Uh, the short answer is no. That I agree that if we were conceding it, which were not, that would be the mechanism that we would use. We probably wouldn't actually alter the red line. We would, we would add something into the DCO to, to restrict, to have a no surface structure, um, restriction

within, within, within, within an area. But as you, as you will have gathered on this very new issue, um, we, we don't think the case is made.

00:47:13:27 - 00:47:14:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:47:15:01 - 00:47:54:02

Mr. BOSWELL It seems from both what, um, have said in terms of having actually raised this concern previously and UK Chamber of Shipping have also said that they raised that concern in 2018 and 2021. So it is something that has been brought to your attention previously. So it may not be as brand new an issue as you're suggesting. So that's one point. The second point is that this might be maybe a month too early in examination for me to ask this question, but are we looking at a potential impasse here between yourselves and.

00:47:57:01 - 00:48:27:20

Julian Boswell for the applicant. 1 or 2 things, if I may, I would like Mrs. Westwood to respond to the point. You're to the suggestion that or or think to to respond to the question of how the how any issue to do with the debt north area has come up at different times. I think that is important. And if and if it's okay for her to respond to what the Chamber of Shipping has has said, I think that the.

00:48:28:25 - 00:49:01:18

On the 18th of January. I said in good faith that we thought that everything was agreed. And so we are still processing in some ways how it is that we're having a debate about something that we thought was agreed in the usual way. And so we are. Continuing to look at that. And so I'm a bit reluctant, as you can imagine, to to to say that we're going to end up at an at an impasse.

00:49:01:20 - 00:49:43:02

I think it's too early. Equally. I did say earlier that. We think this might be heading towards a full blown hearing on on on this or certainly potentially a request from us for that. Um, uh, because the stakes do, do do appear to be high and I think it's really important. Um, and I think there may be some, you know, it's really important that, that you do understand all of the aspects because we obviously recognize that the, um, when it gives advice that's inevitably going to attract substantial weight.

00:49:43:04 - 00:50:14:11

And so if we're inviting you to disagree with that advice, then there needs to be a very clear basis for that. But equally, we say there has to be a very clear basis for the Mca's advice, and that is where, as you will have gathered from, from what we've said and Mrs. Westwood's submissions that we that we continue to struggle, um, a in terms of why they're taking the position that they are and B, in terms of the, the efficacy or not of, of the mitigation that's being suggested.

00:50:14:23 - 00:50:17:24

Is it okay if Mrs. Westwood addresses the.

00:50:18:07 - 00:50:23:15

For sure. I do have several other questions. I don't want to forget them. So perhaps.

00:50:27:20 - 00:50:36:00

Okay. Yeah. Do tell us a bit about the consultation and then I just want to move on to next steps and have a several points there.

00:50:37:14 - 00:51:13:15

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. And I'd like to thank the Chamber of Shipping for acknowledging the amount of consultation that we've done with them to date. As he stated himself, bringing them along the process to the point that we started the statement of Common ground discussions with the Chamber of Shipping last year and think Mr. Murali would agree that their concerns in since we first started consultation um on the navigational risk assessment and the DEP and extensions has been around loss of sea area and by loss of sea area.

00:51:13:17 - 00:52:02:03

We are not just talking in relation to the DEP and extensions but also to the cumulative developments within the southern North Sea and the wider North Sea in general. And you know, also transboundary developments and and think if you look at the statement of common ground that we have agreed with the Chamber of Shipping by the fact that the isolation impacts and the cumulative impacts are not agreed, but no material impact is is a demonstration that this is about a wider discussion about loss of sea area due to wind farm development rather than specific specifically about the collision risk value of DEP north and think that's what was the surprise to us when we heard about this in January.

00:52:02:18 - 00:52:27:24

You know, we've been fully open with the Chamber of Shipping all the way along. There's been good two way conversation. We recognize their concerns, but this is a question of whether vessels can navigate safely in the area around DEP north. And just to reiterate the navigational risk assessment, which is the output of the process we've been through, demonstrates that that is, um, that is the case, that the risk is a lot.

00:52:28:18 - 00:53:04:07

Okay. Okay. Thank you. Noted. And I will get comments back from both parties in a minute. Uh, there's a few things that we've said. You mentioned, Ms.. Westwood, that you've got figures relating to the. No, I think we've already noted that down as a hearing action, haven't we? Um, you talked about some statistics, um, about the collision risk and can you submit those statistics to us if they're not already in the application documents? Yeah.

00:53:04:09 - 00:53:28:20

Okay. The second point was just going to some of the things that Mr. Boswell's just alluded to. If this was a what are the implications of you not reaching agreement? So just tell, tell us. Um, from a policy point of view and legislation point of view, what are the implications of you not reaching an agreement?

00:53:30:13 - 00:54:01:21

Um, and in terms of the second question is you've referred to needing another hearing on this regard. Um, just put some flesh on the bones there as well. When will you tell us whether you are requesting such a hearing? The purpose of such a hearing and what you expect to achieve at that hearing. There is a third and related question is what are we going to do between now and deadline three? In order for us to be able to take that decision regarding next steps? You're right, Mr.

00:54:01:23 - 00:54:22:15

Boswell. I agree that it might be too early to say whether this is an impasse or not, but it seems, as you've said, that the stakes are high. Um, so. So, yeah, so, so just respond to those three questions and then I would like to get and Chamber of Shipping back for some comments.

00:54:28:29 - 00:55:03:14

Madam Julian Boswell for the applicant. I don't have the reference to hand, but that's fine. Clearly there, there, there will be or there is a form of words in there that relates to navigational safety. And we don't we don't we don't, of course, dispute that. That is an important consideration. And that's exactly why why we followed the process in the normal way that we have. Um, in terms of. The

implications. The. The implications mean obviously we don't know exactly how this is going to pan out.

00:55:03:17 - 00:55:14:17

Um, but, um, and so anything I say now could be overtaken. So please bear that in mind, of course. But, um.

00:55:16:03 - 00:55:17:27

I think we.

00:55:20:13 - 00:55:26:17

We're still. We're still. We're still reflecting on the on the position. The question is.

00:55:29:18 - 00:55:48:28

But the reason I'm hesitating is I'm not sure I've got specific instructions on this, and I'm slightly wary of saying something without specific instructions that it might be better if it's okay if I came back on this point after the lunch break. Yeah. Um, and in terms of the hearing,

00:55:50:13 - 00:56:25:23

the what's in our mind is that this really is a complex subject. Um, and. That normally the way this is resolved is that everything is essentially signed up before you submit with the navigation risk assessment and then what plays out thereafter in terms of statements and common ground and participation in the in the examination is pretty straightforward because the system has worked and everybody is there or thereabouts on the same page.

00:56:26:02 - 00:57:02:02

Um, and so, uh. If unexpectedly, in this case we do have a material issue. Then on a specialist topic, we think that it would be potentially appropriate to to go over the, you know, the the points in more detail. Um, so as that we have got the comfort that we really have had the fullest and fairest opportunity to explain where we are coming from.

00:57:02:12 - 00:57:41:04

Um, and obviously the others have, have, have, have had that opportunity and everybody's positions have been thoroughly tested. Um, so that is that, that is in essence what, what, what, what we, what what we have been sort of thinking with within the team in recent days. Um, and in terms of when we might ask for that again, I would prefer to reserve our position on that. There are, there are some hearing dates scheduled for June, aren't there, on a on a reserve basis and think it would be in those that we would be targeting.

00:57:41:06 - 00:57:51:18

I don't think we're asking for for that to be scheduled differently to that. But if and so I think that's probably as much as I've I can say at this time.

00:57:52:01 - 00:58:10:21

Just if you would also consider what you would do between now and deadline three in order to move this along and what we can expect. Deadline three um, either in the form of a statement of common ground, um, or indeed even a three way. Position statement, but we'll have some think about that. But yeah, over to you.

00:58:11:03 - 00:58:15:16

Julian Boswell for the applicant. Well, as Mrs. Westwood's explained,

00:58:17:03 - 00:58:53:11

the lines of communication are established for literally years on this subject. And so they will continue to, to, to operate, I'm sure. Um. And so I'm not sure I can. We. Obviously on deadline three were obliged to put in summaries of case. Um, and we have obviously a statement of common ground in motion at the moment, though it's taken, as we've explained, an unexpected turn. I guess that on the face of it is the main sort of formal vehicle for those discussions.

00:58:53:17 - 00:59:24:27

Um, and whether it and we'll have to decide how, what further submissions we think it would assist. Um, Mrs. Westwood mentioned a figure that speaks to that 14% point that she made, for example. Um, and as I say, we're very keen to take the panel with us in terms of understanding that the complexities and the nuances, but also the kind of point that Mrs.

00:59:24:29 - 01:00:04:19

Westwood just made then about there being more than one thing in play here, that it is inevitably the case that with more and more offshore wind farms being constructed, that that limits what would otherwise have been possible in terms of in terms of shipping. And there is a balance that has to be struck and so on and so forth. And that is one issue. But then on any given wind farm, as she explained, you've got particular issues around safety for that particular windfarm. My colleague has found the paragraph reference in the 2011, if I may, which is 2.6, point one, six five, and this is in.

01:00:05:23 - 01:00:27:27

And three and it says obviously it's the. So in practice, the secretary of state should not consent applications which pose unacceptable risks to navigational safety. After all, possible mitigation measures have been considered. So I think that's the core policy test and we agree with that. But we're confident that we're the right side of that line.

01:00:29:18 - 01:00:45:18

Um, okay. Uh, I think there is a fair bit to process here. I did have one question for Mr. uh, and this is potentially an action, so. Mr. Salter if you're still there.

01:00:49:01 - 01:01:23:14

I think one thing, Mr. Salter, that will help us, the examining authority is, um, you've alluded to some, you know, getting a clearer picture during the examination which has led you to draw the conclusion that you have. And I think just highlighting quite clearly, the applicant obviously disputes that and says that you've had that picture for quite some time, if you can highlight quite clearly what. What it is in the deadline one submissions that you that has raised alarm bells for you.

01:01:24:04 - 01:01:37:12

Um I think we can quite you know, we can be quite we can be specific in terms of our examination from that point on. Would that, would that be possible for you to do for deadline three?

01:01:39:02 - 01:01:42:09

Then Excelsior. Yes, it's very possible. Yeah.

01:01:43:04 - 01:02:15:15

Um, one of the things I was going to suggest, um, and we'll probably just discuss that a little bit more between ourselves and specify that, but a lot of actions that we're highlighting now, I wonder if one good way of taking this forward might be for that. A lot of those that material to be exchanged between yourselves well before deadline three so that when you submit a statement of common ground at deadline three, you both had sight of that information and the statement of Common ground takes that on board.

01:02:15:17 - 01:02:29:20

So I'm just almost trying to, to, um, skip a step here for you to respond to each other's submissions after deadline. Three deadline three. You're really responding to each other's submissions at deadline three.

01:02:33:18 - 01:02:36:14

Barrett I of the applicant. Yes, that's. That's fine.

01:02:36:16 - 01:03:06:27

Um, hopefully it's been clear that, you know, it will continue to be the case that we'll engage with the directly. Um, I think you'll have understood from the comments that have been made this morning that this is evolving. You know, we had a meeting as recently as last Friday, which is a, you know, productive and positive meeting. Um, the figures clearly came through yesterday. We only just saw those when they got published. So we are, you know, still sort of digesting the mca's comments and position and.

01:03:06:29 - 01:03:21:14

Absolutely. Yeah. Any further kind of information we would look to share that directly with the, um, irrespective of, of the deadlines. So we can give you a sort of status update at nine three on, you know, where those continued discussions have got to.

01:03:21:18 - 01:03:26:04

Absolutely. And of course, think just in terms of scheduling things.

01:03:27:18 - 01:03:28:03

Um.

01:03:30:00 - 01:03:33:04

I'm just thinking about the hearing as well. Um,

01:03:34:22 - 01:03:39:00

we'll get back to you about that if we've got a related point, but, um.

01:03:51:06 - 01:03:51:28

It was just.

01:03:52:02 - 01:04:02:26

Um, one other question which I had which just wanted to flesh out a little bit in terms of the issue. Um, for Mr. Salter at the Marine Coast Guard Agency.

01:04:06:03 - 01:04:08:24

Are you still there, sir? There you go.

01:04:10:23 - 01:04:43:28

Thank you. Um, any response to first written questions? You've stated that the submitted navigational management plan is the only additional mitigation measure, uh, proposed for reduced risk to as low as reasonably practicable or LARP. Um, but also that the hazard log does not consider sufficiently the hazard for assessing collision risk between two third party vessels as a result of the reduced sea space. Is that a separate issue to the sea space or is that particularly to do with um.

01:04:45:18 - 01:04:53:06

Third party vessels. Is that something that you don't feel as being considered sufficiently within the the.

01:04:56:00 - 01:04:59:28

Think seltzer for the MCI. But think on on that.

01:05:00:00 - 01:05:31:09

Specific point between third collision risk between third party vessels. It was picked up as the hazard was focused on displacement or that's what it appeared to. And it was the consequence scoring within that row of the hazard log, which is which is being contested, where it was assessed as no negligible impact. However, if there is in the event of a third party to third party collision, you would not have no negligible impact.

01:05:31:20 - 01:05:38:17

There will be damage to the vessel that would be damaged in business reputation and even possible pollution damage.

01:05:39:14 - 01:05:40:02

Okay.

01:05:40:09 - 01:05:44:06

Understand? Um, would the applicant like to come back to me on that one?

01:05:47:02 - 01:06:22:17

And the Westwood for the applicant. So just to be clear, the hazard log is an output of the Hazard workshop which took place on the 10th of August 2021. A draft minutes and log were for comment was sent to all parties that attended that workshop on the 9th of September. A reminder for comments were issued on the 24th of September and a final log was issued on the 19th of November 2021 to all attendees. So just to really highlight there that that log is a specific output of that meeting of that hazard workshop and is reflective of the discussions that we had with all of the parties involved.

01:06:23:06 - 01:06:56:12

Um, I guess just to move on in terms of um, the ranking of collision risk, um, the way that we've looked at it within that hazard log is the wind farm cannot cause two vessels to collide. Something has to happen to those vessels to put them in a position where they could then encounter each other. So that's why we then look at displacement as the pathway, if you like, to collision vessels are displaced or compressed into an enclosed area encounters and then um incur and some of those encounters could then result in a collision event.

01:06:56:24 - 01:07:28:02

So what we've looked at there is the most likely pardon, the most likely impact is that two vessels may or may encounter, there may be an increase in encounters. But again, referring back to accident and incident statistics for the area, it is unlikely that those encounters would then result in a collision event. However, I think it's then important to note that within the navigational risk assessment we have separated out those impacts and and talked about that detail.

01:07:28:04 - 01:07:36:16

So then displacement is looked at on its own and then collision risk is also then looked at on on its own basis as well. Okay.

01:07:36:18 - 01:07:42:03

Thank you. Um, back to Mr. Salter on that, if you've got any. Response to what you've just heard.

01:07:45:03 - 01:07:45:18

And.

01:07:46:29 - 01:07:56:04

It's it still comes back to that that northern northern section of dudgeon extension. We think it's the navigational squeeze.

01:07:56:07 - 01:08:05:19

Is increasing the probability of encounter. And overall, we think that the collision risk assessment has been underestimated.

01:08:10:14 - 01:08:11:11

Okay. Thank you.

01:08:12:28 - 01:08:15:09

Welcome back with any final point on that.

01:08:16:27 - 01:08:20:17

It's about the Westwood for the applicant. Now, think we've covered off everything to say on that point.

01:08:22:14 - 01:08:29:19

Okay. Thank you all. Um. Has anyone else got any comments to make on the issue of shipping a navigation?

01:08:34:12 - 01:08:37:00

No. Okay. Um.

01:08:54:12 - 01:09:26:06

Okay. Um, as we suggested earlier, we will have to put agenda item five for the helicopter access till after lunch. Um, so. But we will come to that first after lunch. Um, so what we're going to do is we're going to have a lunch break now so we can come back, um, at for 2:00. So it's just a couple of minutes to 1:00 at the moment. So we'll break for lunch now. We'll resume at exactly 2 p.m. for any attendees online.

01:09:26:08 - 01:09:39:19

If you decide to leave the meeting during the break, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in the invitation email. If you watch the live stream then please refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session. Thank you. Hearing's now adjourned.