

ISH6_31 March_PT4

Created on: 2023-03-31 15:31:22

Project Length: 00:08:40

File Name: ISH6_31 March_PT4

File Length: 00:08:40

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:09 - 00:00:36:16

Okay. Thank you, everybody. We will resume the hearing. Um, is anyone logged back in on teams? Who needs to? The case team can just confirm. Perfect. Thank you very much. Okay. Don't believe any procedural decisions emerging from today's hearing. Um, so I'll now run through the hearing actions, a list of which there are 15. Um, and please assume that the actions are for the applicant to be completed by deadline three unless otherwise stated.

00:00:38:03 - 00:00:46:25

These are the applicant to provide succinct written explanation of potential impact of exit pits on the Z.

00:00:48:18 - 00:01:09:13

The MMO to provide any information it has on historic oyster beds in the area. The examining authority to direct a written question to natural England, asking them to provide a view on what level of oyster beds, success or partial success would be considered a suitable compensatory measure.

00:01:11:18 - 00:01:29:08

The applicant and Marine and Coast Guard agency to continue discussions on areas of disagreement with an update to be provided at deadline three. Also, if no agreement is reached by deadline for the applicant and or the MTA to request a hearing.

00:01:31:12 - 00:01:41:06

At link to action for the data specifically set out to the examining authority what aspects of the applicant's deadline one submission has resulted in its concerns.

00:01:43:18 - 00:01:51:12

The applicant to submit the calculations and figures which draw out the 14% risk associated with the navigational buffer.

00:01:54:18 - 00:01:58:28

Applicant to provide statistics to the examination on collision risk.

00:02:01:29 - 00:02:05:18

Applicant to set out the implications of not reaching an agreement with the.

00:02:09:25 - 00:02:30:14

Discussions between the applicant and Perenchio to continue to seek to overcome disagreements with an update to be provided at Deadline three. And as part of this plan to provide information on potential economic effects on its operations, parties to provide more evidence to set out their positions with reference to current best practice.

00:02:32:05 - 00:02:48:09

With regard to new guidance provide comparative calculations. At parties to provide information on matters associated with the CAA and HORNSEA project. Four And lastly, to explore the potential for a cooperation agreement.

00:02:50:04 - 00:02:59:12

Number ten applicant to continue discussions with DIO, including any necessary mitigation and provide an updated deadline. Three.

00:03:01:23 - 00:03:07:20

A statement of common ground with Norwich Airport to be provided by the applicant at deadline three.

00:03:09:17 - 00:03:15:10

12 further discussion with gnats to be undertaken and an update provided at deadline three.

00:03:18:06 - 00:03:29:09

13 Eastern Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authority to provide further information on the potential for fishing restrictions due to construction to result in beneficial benefits to fish stocks.

00:03:31:19 - 00:04:08:26

14 Jonas Seafoods to provide further information to demonstrate effect on the on the business during previous wind farm construction. Further more justification to be provided to demonstrate why Jonas Seafood is a special case in relation to compensation. This to be provided to the applicant and then replies to this additional information then provided. Deadline three. And lastly the applicant and to continue discussions on changes to Article five of the draft, including the role of the MMO in paragraph five and wording for a collaboration condition.

00:04:10:00 - 00:04:16:28

The also to research other details where such duplication has been allowed and why.

00:04:19:22 - 00:04:27:03

Okay. And that's the list completed. Um, are there any questions on those?

00:04:30:00 - 00:04:54:00

Okay. Ms. has clarified that from the outset of the hearing. A number of items recorded here as action points may now be raised in written questions. May I remind everyone that the Post hearing notes, documents and answers prepared in response to these post hearing actions or written questions should be provided by the next deadline, which is deadline three on the 2nd of May. I'll now hand over to Mr. Sohi. Thank you.

00:04:55:13 - 00:05:28:21

Thank you very much, Mr. Manning. Thank you, everyone. Um, there's just a couple, two, three additional points. Um, uh, the submissions that have been made in lieu of attendance at the hearings. Um, presumably the applicant is going to respond to those. We were going to suggest that you include responses to those submissions in the, in your oral summary of the hearing. Because most of those points were raised at relevant agenda points. So you can just refer to that under those points.

00:05:28:23 - 00:06:02:17

We're desperately keen to avoid duplication of too many documents coming from you in that vein. The second point is, um, several responses to written questions to first round of written question referred to other documents, see our response and responses to relevant reps and so on. And I do understand that, you know, you want to avoid duplicating the material that you're providing to us.

However, responses to written questions, it would be helpful to have as complete responses as possible.

00:06:02:19 - 00:06:12:25

So where possible, provide a summary response and then signpost where either detailed responses or related responses might be found.

00:06:15:01 - 00:06:15:18

Um.

00:06:18:03 - 00:06:51:19

So in this case for deadline three. Um. There's no there's not going to be any posturing, action responses. It's all going to be in written question. So so I think that will eliminate one set of duplication. And the third, just a general point is that where we seek justification for something, where we've asked you for further justification, could I request that that justification is provided for this specific case and supported by precedents and precedents is always very, very helpful, particularly when it comes to DCO.

00:06:52:09 - 00:07:23:28

But we would require the justification for this particular case first as as the starting point and only to be supported by precedents. The what I'm trying to say is that the precedence can't be the leading point of how you're justifying a particular article or requirement or indeed anything in, in the application. Uh, that's about it. That covers it. Yeah. Is there anything from the applicant and anybody else in response?

00:07:25:24 - 00:07:49:05

Julian Boswell for the applicant, I suppose. Can't resist an observation that. On the point you've just made. If developers have time and time again made a case and it's been accepted by the secretary of State, there really should be a point at which everybody knows that the Secretary of State agrees with that point, and we shouldn't have to be constantly making the case.

00:07:50:12 - 00:08:08:18

The point is that when we write the report, our reasoning can never be that this is acceptable to the examining authority. Secretary of State. You must accept it because your predecessors have accepted it before. As such, the justification really must be provided for this case and supported by precedents.

00:08:11:22 - 00:08:12:28

Any further points?

00:08:15:15 - 00:08:16:00

It.

00:08:18:12 - 00:08:34:20

Uh, so the time is exactly 4:23 p.m.. I just want to thank everyone for the participation today. Think it was a particularly successful hearing and I will proceed to close the issue specific hearing today. Thank you.