

ISH4_Weds 1st March PT2

Created on: 2023-03-01 12:16:36

Project Length: 01:23:56

File Name: ISH4_Weds 1st March PT2

File Length: 01:23:56

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:09 - 00:00:14:26

Okay. Thank you very much. It's now 11:20 and time for us to recommence. I just checked with Mr. Stevens that the recordings reached out to police.

00:00:27:22 - 00:01:06:00

Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay, so we now turn to item free on the agenda. And before we commit to this item, I'll just briefly explain the purpose of this section of this hearing into the draft development consent order, which I'll now call the draft DCI. So the draft DCI is an important document. It's a draft piece of legislation which, if the Secretary of State decides to grant, develop consent, forms a legal basis for the delivery of the proposed development it sets and secures the standards to which a development must be constructed and secures the environmental performance and development, ensuring it does not exceed what is described as the Rochdale envelope, which is assessed in the environmental statement.

00:01:07:10 - 00:01:37:27

This part the hearing is being held on a without prejudice basis. So in essence, even if your position is that development consent should not be granted and therefore that the Secretary State should not make the draft DCO. You can make representations in this hearing on the drafting of the DCO without conceding your wider position that this should not be made. So those of you who participated today can make comments that affect how the DCO is drafted, for example, relating to requirements which are effectively the equivalence of conditions in the Planning Commission.

00:01:38:15 - 00:02:14:10

But you can do this even if your position is that the DCO should not be granted. This is important for the examining authority because we are under a duty to provide the Secretary of State with the best drafted DCO that we can. Even if we end up recommending that Secretary of State should not make the DCO. This is because we as examining authority don't decide these applications. We make recommendations to the Secretary of State and they make the decision. So even if our report report what you recommend that developer consent should not be granted, we would still append a draft DCO, ensuring that the Secretary of State could decide to make one if she or he wishes.

00:02:16:04 - 00:02:45:03

So I just like to start this item as indicated by the first bullet point of the agenda, just by asking the applicant Tyla any changes which have been made to the draft DCO since the version discussed in issue specific one from 21st of September 2022. And also if we have mentioned in the agenda item, if the applicant could undertake a general review of the requirements, how so? If you have or propose any changes as a result of that. I'll be great if you could highlight this too. Thank you.

00:02:45:27 - 00:03:27:29

Thank you, sir. It's done on behalf of the applicant. So I'll start with summarizing the changes that have been made since. Issue specific hearing one. And we have done that review as requested. And there are a few points that we can just we can run through in respect of that. So following issue specific hearing, one, we made a number of changes following on from the examining authority's first

written questions in relation to sort of clarity and consistency. Sorry, I should also say that all these changes as they've been made to the draft development consent order have been identified in the schedule of changes that has accompanied the DCO, and that's been done on a rolling basis.

00:03:28:06 - 00:04:01:08

So rather than there being one for each deadline, there was a single document and each deadline effectively describes the change that's been made. The reason for that change and highlights the drafting. So those are there, if anybody wants to refer that. So what I'm going to do now is just summarise those, the kind of key changes that have been made. So there were also changes made to the definition of commence in Article two following discussions on site preparation works and those being included, and then consequential amendments made to requirements to reflect that change.

00:04:02:08 - 00:04:19:20

We also made a change to the definition of onshore works, and this was we actually talked about this just before, before coffee. We had set up or we drafted the DCO on the basis that onshore works for the purposes of the local authority would

00:04:21:09 - 00:04:56:29

would go to mean high water rather than mean low water. And it became apparent following discussions regarding the requirements and certainly the sort of elements around the code of construction practice and those elements that they did relate very much to the terrestrial planning environment. And therefore it was important to ensure that there was that overlap between the marine licensing and terrestrial planning regimes. So there were changes. So that works. Numbers three and three were effectively drawn into the definition of onshore works.

00:05:00:02 - 00:05:40:05

References to the outline documents that were solely related to the marine licence were removed from the DCO. We added a new requirement relating to the provision of a skills and employment strategy which had been discussed with the North Wales authorities. There were changes to Article 27 regarding temporary use of land. Changes to the parameters of certain built aspects in respect of requirements. Three. So requirement three sets out those parameters and there was that there's a it's the requirement in relation to turbine lighting or lighting instructions structures sorry for aviation safety.

00:05:40:29 - 00:06:46:25

There was further drafting put in in respect of that and r w were added as a consultee to requirement ten which is about to start in the code of construction practice. There were changes to requirement 11 to allow for temp, which is relates to highways accesses to allow for temporary accesses necessary for pre-commencement works to be formed. There was including nationally protected species into requirement 14, which is about European protected species licenses following requests from and notably, we also added a first draft of the protective provisions for real flats offshore wind farm, and we updated schedule the AS schedule 13 list of documents at the next deadline and LW were added as a consultee to requirement six, which is the detail of the substation works and requirement eight which is the landscaping requirement and permanent access.

00:06:46:27 - 00:07:35:06

Roads were included in the drafting in respect of the onshore substation and requirement 19 in relation to operational light emissions At the next deadline, Welsh ministers were added as a consultee to requirement ten, which is the code of construction practice in relation to the soil management plan, and that was specifically in respect of points that they had raised around restoration and maintaining soil condition. There were updates to schedule four, which is the streets and rights of waste be temporarily stopped up following some amendments that had been made to plans and the ESP man web protector provisions were updated because those at that stage had been agreed at the next deadline.

00:07:35:27 - 00:07:53:26

At the request of Trinity House, Article 36 was amended to confirm that the arbitration provisions that apply to the majority of the date apply to the DCO and its operation don't apply to change the Trinity House, and that is a standard

00:07:55:16 - 00:08:32:28

exclusion. We did not admit we did not submit an update to the DCO deadline for a deadline five, which further changes to Article 27 eight in respect of the extent of rights that could be taken in respect to the Schedule six temporary possession plots. Although in we've agreed, we agreed yesterday, we look at the drafting of that one again to make sure that that's clear. We made changes to requirement to the offshore design parameters to ensure consistency in the appearance of the wind turbine generators.

00:08:33:08 - 00:09:05:15

That was following discussions at the hearing in December. And also clarification of the measurement location for the minimum distance between the wind turbine generators in in terms of them being measured from the centre point. And there were also, again, updates to Schedule 13 on the documents to be certified. And then at deadline, six changes were made to requirement for regarding offshore noise to provide further clarity around how the requirement would operate.

00:09:06:02 - 00:09:35:21

And that was wording added in relation to the noise measurement, location point and what onshore wind where the conditions are just to make that clearer. Further maximum building heights were added in relation to the onshore substation buildings and Requirement seven, which had been following a discussion. I think that was a question, comment, question or hearing action in terms of specifying those at the request of the examining authority.

00:09:37:12 - 00:10:15:18

A requirement 25 was added, which is the flood risk activity method statement requirement to provide an approval methodology for Natural Resources Wales in relation to watercourse crossings and address their concerns regarding the dis application of the flood risk activity permit. You may well be aware that we haven't quite persuaded, and I'll tell you that they would like to disapply the frappe requirements. So if we aren't able to move to get them to agree to that, that requirement will be removed because we'll have to remove the dis application of the frack because it requires a new consent.

00:10:16:07 - 00:10:52:24

So that was that point. And a new set of protective provisions were added for Comrie County Borough Council in relation. To the offshore piling noise monitoring plan in response to concerns that they had raised around monitoring. And the reason we added those as protected provisions rather than as a requirement is because Conway County cap com we County Borough council are not the planning authority for the purposes of discharge if the requirements and therefore if we added it as a requirement, it would have needed to be done through Denbighshire County Council.

00:10:53:00 - 00:11:11:12

And actually it's a common way concern rather than denbighshire. So. So we agreed that we would do it through protected provisions rather than it being an additional requirement to the DCO because we don't have enforcement powers in respect of of those works. So those are the changes that have been made.

00:11:13:06 - 00:12:00:16

Since issue specific hearing one. So we've sought to make changes in response to questions raised or clarifications from the examining authority and also in conjunction with various consultees and regulators to ensure that the DCO works in the way that. That they're comfortable with. And alongside that, as everybody will be aware, through all the updates to the outline plans, we've also been updating the what I term the control documents, so the outline management plans to ensure that they also are encapsulating those elements that the regulatory bodies are seeking so that when the requirements are discharged.

00:12:00:19 - 00:12:13:12

Those elements that you wouldn't draft into the requirements because they become too long and actually that they've become too complex and inflexible, that those are actually captured. Then in the outline documents as well.

00:12:14:28 - 00:12:19:14

Are there any questions on that? Before I go on to our review of the DCO.

00:12:20:06 - 00:12:21:09

I don't think Thank you.

00:12:22:13 - 00:12:53:03

In terms of the review of the draft development consent order, we focused that review as requested or suggested by the examining authority on the sort of implementation timing maintenance requirements in respect of the different requirements. So I'll run through those. And if there are any other changes that we've picked up that we think we may need to make some. So in respect of requirement one, which is time limits, we're not suggesting any change there.

00:12:53:05 - 00:13:09:08

There's nothing needed a requirement to offshore design parameters. Again, no change needed to the aviation safety requirement. I understand there are some formatting changes that need to be made to that one, but apart from that, there's no there's no change to the substance

00:13:10:29 - 00:13:44:20

in terms of requirement five a requirement for. Which is the offshore noise requirement. Again, some formatting changes, but there's nothing of substance. The requirement five stages of the authorized development. We're not proposing any changes to that. To that requirement. And going back to the question around an implementation provision, there is an implementation provision within that requirement and a maintenance clause wouldn't be appropriate because it's effectively it will be.

00:13:45:03 - 00:14:16:17

Will carry it out in accordance with the stages and therefore there's no further drafting there. In relation to requirement six, which is the substation works, there is an implementation provision in terms of the substation works must be implemented as approved and here we wouldn't expect a maintenance provision. Just if I sort of explain before we get into the details where we would expect to see a maintenance provision is where something is securing mitigation or something further down the line.

00:14:16:19 - 00:14:31:07

So it's it's important that it's maintained for the purposes of the development. We wouldn't expect to see maintenance clauses around, for example, keeping the works that are put in maintained because that is managed through

00:14:32:26 - 00:14:51:02

effectively. It's in our interests that we keep those things going. And you wouldn't you wouldn't see on a normal planning permission a maintenance clause to say you have to maintain those works as approved. So, so where there is a maintenance clause, it's because effectively that's delivering mitigation or those sorts of works that need to remain in place.

00:14:53:10 - 00:15:03:13

The next requirement is requirement seven, which is the detailed design parameters on. Sure, not expecting any changes to that at present.

00:15:05:14 - 00:15:18:19

Provision of landscaping requirement eight We have noted that that doesn't include an implementation provision and we will add that to the next draft of the of the DCO.

00:15:21:15 - 00:15:52:12

The requirement nine, which is the implementation and maintenance of landscaping. Effectively, those two requirements work together, so we just need to ensure that those are aligned. Requirement ten The Code of Construction Practice. There is an implementation provision included there and again, this isn't one where we'd expect there to be a maintenance a maintenance provision. Highways access is again, there is an implementation provision there.

00:15:54:01 - 00:16:24:29

We wouldn't expect there to be a maintenance provision in respect of that one. So we're not proposing to make any check, make any changes there. Requirement 12 Onshore Archaeology. There is an implementation provision for Pre-commencement works but not for other work. So I think, well, I want to make sure that that is clear. And again, we wouldn't expect a maintenance provision for in respect of that. 113.

00:16:25:01 - 00:16:41:18

The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. There is an implementation provision in paragraph two landscaping maintenance would be provided for is provided for received requirement nine. And.

00:16:44:00 - 00:17:09:20

We can consider putting an ecological maintenance condition, but I suspect that will be dealt with through the o lamp rather than. So so the detail of maintenance would be in accordance with the approved lamps. So it may be that we we do add to maintenance provision in respect of that, but the detail on those periods of maintenance and those elements will be agreed through the lamp

00:17:11:23 - 00:17:51:21

European protected Species, which is requirement 14 it does have an implementation provision and the European Protected species license itself will deal with whatever maintenance is needed and therefore we don't need a maintenance provision within this requirement. Construction hours. There's no change to that being proposed, a requirement 16, which is surface and far water drainage. There is an implementation provision included and we suggest that doesn't need to be a maintenance provision there because that's that would be part of the development.

00:17:52:16 - 00:18:28:26

There was a question around amending this for pre construction Pre-commencement works, which is one of the subsequent questions. We don't think it's appropriate to deal with that in this requirement in terms of of placing a requirement or amending this requirement to deal with Pre-commencement works because it is very much focused on permanent drainage for work. Number 31 I. But we will add some wording to the construction method statement to make clear that pre-construction drainage will be dealt with through the construction method statement.

00:18:29:17 - 00:18:30:18

It makes sense.

00:18:33:11 - 00:18:46:05

In terms of requirements 17 Restoration of Land. Again, there's an implementation provision for that, and maintenance wouldn't be appropriate because once we restored land, we would be

00:18:48:09 - 00:18:50:11

hunting it back and not having any further control.

00:18:52:15 - 00:19:30:18

Control of noise during the operational stages, no changes proposed there. Control of operational artificial light emissions, which is requirement 19. It has both implementation and maintenance provisions requirement to the skills and employment strategy. We will add an implementation provision to that one, but not a maintenance provision because it's not appropriate given the type of type of strategy. Offshore decommissioning, which is requirement 21, a maintenance provision, isn't relevant or appropriate that that wouldn't be.

00:19:30:20 - 00:19:40:07

And we're not suggesting an implementation clause actually, because that's all managed through the scheme approved by the Secretary of State under the Energy Act 2004

00:19:41:27 - 00:19:57:13

onshore decommissioning requirement 22 that has again, an implementation provision and we wouldn't expect a maintenance provision there requirement 23, which is amendments to approve details. This no no change is proposed there

00:19:59:02 - 00:19:59:22

and

00:20:01:11 - 00:20:19:29

so 23 is requirement for written approval. 24 is amendments to approve details, not expecting changes there. And obviously requirement 25 we've mentioned in terms of the flood risk activity permit and method statement. And if that can't be agreed, then we will remove that from the final draft of the DCO.

00:20:23:15 - 00:20:31:13

Thank you very much. Mr.. That was very useful. And yeah, I probably pre-empts quite a few of our questions later on so that that's useful.

00:20:33:00 - 00:20:39:01

We have a range of questions, obviously, as indicated in the agenda from a number of us on the panel.

00:20:40:26 - 00:21:13:22

These are primarily directed at the applicant, although there will be that question, say for instance for, for Conway and for them sure as appropriate. But if anyone wants to come in with any comments or questions relating to a specific topic when we're talking about it, then just please let me know. Obviously in the room or on the hands up function on and Microsoft teams. And obviously before we move on from the overall agenda item, then I'll ask anybody if there's any further comments. So article two, if we could could start with that.

00:21:14:10 - 00:21:19:27

And in the last session you answered quite a few of my questions on that one. So thank you for that,

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

which is very useful. I just had one question and that we discussed, or it was mentioned in the before the break about document App 047, which is the offshore project description. So Volume two, Chapter one of the environmental statement.

00:21:41:15 - 00:21:49:16

And it's just a simple question really, what Pre-commencement works, the details within that document, would they be covered within the Marine licence?

00:21:59:12 - 00:22:37:06

So let's start on behalf of the applicant. I need to check which works. It is we're looking at there in respect of those works. The discussions around Pre-commencement works that we've had in the context of the DCO aren't Discussions that we've had with are not in the context of the marine licence to date and questions haven't been raised by notably either advisory regulatory in relation to the carrying out of those works. I'm happy that we take that one away and perhaps talk to another Marine licensing team around that.

00:22:37:17 - 00:23:05:28

Although recognising that obviously, as we've said, the content of the marine licence and those various plans is very much with, with and notably I suggest perhaps the way to do it is for us to put it on and not to produce radar, so to say so to speak, so that they can ensure that if they have any concerns about those works or if there are any matters within the marine licence that need to be managed differently in respect of those, then they will be they would deal with those.

00:23:07:13 - 00:23:13:10

Okay, thank you. So of eight note by deadline seven. Yeah. Thank you for a beautiful

00:23:14:28 - 00:23:18:19

Mr. Morrison said. Anything you want to say on that matter from another view.

00:23:21:13 - 00:23:21:28

And.

00:23:22:06 - 00:23:28:17

No, nothing. Nothing to add at the moment. I'd have to look into that bit more and get back to you. Okay. Thank you.

00:23:31:06 - 00:23:35:23

Okay, so then we'll move on to Article seven. See?

00:23:37:10 - 00:23:42:00

You may not have much more to add on this because obviously you've already covered it a couple of minutes ago.

00:23:46:22 - 00:23:53:28

It was a Did you have any more comments on the matter at seven C other than what you've already said about your requirement 25.

00:23:54:20 - 00:24:28:04

Sales done on behalf of the applicant? And we've had pretty extensive discussions with you around this and sort of saying to provide the comfort to our not only regarding this application of the frappe through there being other sort of mechanisms in respect of their approval of works. They have

concerns around fees being payable, those sorts of things. So we've we've sought to address those and we were hoping to have made some progress, but they are.

00:24:28:29 - 00:24:50:24

You're listing from the from the most recent representation that that that they're not comfortable with this applying. And I'm not sure whether we'll try again or whether we may just accept that that it is a it is a dis application that requires the consent of natural resources. Wales So we're not in a position to include it if they, if they don't consent.

00:24:51:11 - 00:24:52:12

Okay. Thank you. That's

00:24:54:21 - 00:24:57:26

okay. Thank you. So on that pass over to Dr. Morgan.

00:24:59:22 - 00:25:13:21

Thank you, Mr. Hartley. I just know like to discuss Article ten application of the New Roads Industry Act 1991 in relation to the proposed works and the A55. I know it came up several times yesterday,

00:25:15:14 - 00:25:53:09

but we noted in its response to q11097 the Welsh Government work the view that the work should be consented into section 61 of the New Road and Street Works Act 1991, and as a consequence, Section one should be removed from part four and insisted part two of Article ten of the draft eco it its comments in response made by Welsh Government to excuse one rep 2003 The applicant's position was that no changes to Article ten required and that a Section 61 licence was not needed.

00:25:54:09 - 00:25:57:01

Discussions on this point were ongoing with Welsh Government

00:25:58:17 - 00:26:20:21

and we note from the update provided by the application deadline six on location negotiations with landowners Rep six zero 16 that it is still its position that Section 61 should not apply and protective provisions have been have been proposed. The Welsh Government. Have you got anything further to add on that that point at this stage?

00:26:20:27 - 00:26:52:06

So Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, I'll just briefly set the context. I can say that we are still in active discussions with our government regarding this and hopeful of making some progress. So the Section 61 consent is consent to is a requirement for the street authority. In this case, it will be Welsh Government to its requirement for their consent to place apparatus in a protected street. And here we're talking about the a55.

00:26:52:25 - 00:27:49:07

There is a question as to whether actually we are placing cables in a protected street because this is where the cables will be underneath the a55. So from a kind of an interpretation perspective, there is a question as to whether these are actually in the street or below the street, as it were, in which case we're just dealing with issues around subsoil ownership. But we had sought to disapply Section 61, and the reason for the dis application was really to try and ensure that it's exactly the same reason as we were seeking to disapply the FRAP and that the sort of principles of the end set process and for development consent orders is that that to tie up as many consents as you can at the consent stage in order that effectively you're not then tied up in terms of having to secure those further consents that could have been brought earlier at a later stage.

00:27:49:22 - 00:27:59:23

So where we are with Welsh Government, I think as noted in the in the most recent deadline, six is there are active discussions taking place

00:28:01:14 - 00:28:45:17

and we are hopeful that we will be able to agree this matter with Welsh Government. We've drafted protective provisions which are with Welsh Government that will Welsh Government's concerns have been around the control and effectively the sign off of those works and those sorts of elements to ensure that that they have an understanding of what's taking place and there are suitable measures and controls in place. So we've provided those additional protective provisions to Welsh Government than not in the DCO that we've submitted a deadline six as you'll be aware, because we've only just sent them to Welsh Government at that stage and that will provide for input from Welsh Government to both design process and effectively.

00:28:45:20 - 00:29:04:15

For them to approve the details of how matters are done. We are hopeful of reaching agreement and will update. We're working hard on this one and we will we will notify the examining authority as we progress and if those protective provisions, as we hope, are agreed, then they will go into the next draft of the decision.

00:29:06:07 - 00:29:15:00

That's great. Thank you, Christine. I just wondered if you're aware of any precedents for such a just application of that act in intensive projects.

00:29:16:00 - 00:29:47:21

So unless done on behalf of the applicant. The provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act and various provisions on it are reasonably regularly applied in relation to DCO projects. I don't have a list of other projects where they've been supplied, but certainly in other projects that I've worked on they have been. So it's, it's just a case of, of. But ultimately we recognise that, you know, if Welsh Government don't agree then we'd need to move that from the, from the dis application.

00:29:49:15 - 00:30:04:29

Okay. Thank you, Ms.. Ten. We did invite Welsh Government to the hearing today. And unfortunately, I don't think a representative is actually present. And I suppose anyone else would like to voice any comments on this, this point, very specific point. Mr. DAVIS.

00:30:07:20 - 00:30:13:13

Yes. Our Mr. Good did it to make sure that we had Corbyn and Nathan Clear have it

00:30:15:01 - 00:30:46:20

So far be it. We're an urban race or so they the London charade. Well, specifically they can continue it and gains that control of Mexico Tech. Do you want to have it? Guys that are far pin three which in so far classically across your enormous net. Yeah what a well in your car sit down still after all.

00:30:48:06 - 00:31:06:21

Pain in Yosemite that, you know, our gala roulette wheel. Remember Traitor, Center, Middle Order d'Italia, unless you can agree on the Michael Moore Beth Perry gown because my pharmacist, my he encouraged them last year and stared up in pimpin for several present up in pain

00:31:08:10 - 00:31:11:19

photographs go to the Jefferson County down to you they'll come up.

00:31:16:15 - 00:31:24:11

Thank you, Mr. Davis. And the question I asked the applicant was a pretty specific point relating to the a55 and the works under it.

00:31:26:05 - 00:31:34:11

I don't know if you'd like to comment or someone in your team want to comment on the issue raised by Mr. Griffiths. Davis Sorry.

00:31:37:01 - 00:32:02:15

So it is done on behalf of that. And given that we're focusing on the articles of the DCO here, and this is in respect specifically of Article ten and the application of the New Rights and Street Works Act, is that something we could perhaps pick up at the end just in terms of of that point around access from cross code? Right. Because the provisions that we're discussing here aren't relevant to, aren't relevant to the to the road there.

00:32:03:18 - 00:32:08:21

Yeah, I think that's a sensible question. Kim suggestion. So we'll pick it up later.

00:32:11:28 - 00:32:18:27

Any other comments on that particular article? If not, I'll hand back to this topic.

00:32:20:21 - 00:32:47:28

Thank you. So if we could move on to an Article 35 abatement of works abandoned or decayed. This may seem a bit of an unusual question, and I know there is plenty of precedent for this article, but we have notice it clearly only refers to offshore works. So there's just a simple question Is there a need to extend that article to onshore works, say, for instance, to work number 31 as a substation?

00:32:49:12 - 00:32:53:02

So it's done on behalf of the applicant. The.

00:32:55:13 - 00:32:56:00

This.

00:32:57:26 - 00:33:39:03

Article relates to the requirement under the 2004 Act in relation to or is linked to the 2004 Act and the obligations not to leave things in the marine environment and a requirement to decommission. And I, I don't specifically know the answer to why it is only ever related to offshore elements, but I suspect it's because of the

00:33:41:03 - 00:34:17:07

the difference in the control and management type provisions and ownership, etc. of land and the ability to undertake various works in respect of the marine environment that don't aren't equivalent in the terrestrial planning environment, and that in respect of the terrestrial planning environment, clearly you can have planning conditions which say these are, you know, these are these elements you'd need to decommission at the end of the project or whatever it is.

00:34:18:12 - 00:34:39:04

Whereas you can't I think there was uncertainty around that. That being done through in the marine environment, and I've certainly never seen a marine licence condition that requires this because it tends to be done on the face of the DCO by reference to the 2008 Act. So

00:34:41:09 - 00:34:57:16

I haven't ever looked at it in a huge amount of detail. But I think that the basis on which it is, it is focused on, on infrastructure in the marine environment, rather than dealing with anything in the trust your environment, because the terrestrial environment can be managed through planning conditions.

00:35:00:04 - 00:35:14:02

Okay. Thank you for that. That's useful. Okay. So if we could then be able to Article 40 place, which is the certification of plans in conjunction with schedule 13.

00:35:15:27 - 00:35:34:20

So I would just have a free document, actually full document potentially, which may or may not needed to be added. So just like your views on these. So the first one would be the offshore archaeological written scheme for investigation, which is document document approval.

00:35:35:12 - 00:35:36:26

So it's done on behalf of the applicant.

00:35:38:20 - 00:36:11:23

We had included this. We had included it in the list. I think it's come out of the list has met. So we included it within the DCO application documents. And then I think at deadline one where we, we reviewed the DCO and recognised that there were documents that were referred or that had been submitted as part of the DCO application that were referred to here, but were essentially marine licence matters, that those matters should be taken out of the DCO.

00:36:12:06 - 00:36:19:25

So our approach to date has been and I think it picks up on what we were talking about this morning that.

00:36:21:13 - 00:36:55:21

There is no reason for anything that is solely related to or secured by the Marine license to be included in this list. So if it is still included in this list, it shouldn't be. But. But if it isn't, then that's deliberate because effectively there's nothing within the DCO that secures anything in relation to it. So certifying it won't do anything because ultimately what the offshore written scheme of investigation contains is a matter for you under the marine licence.

00:36:56:14 - 00:37:08:03

Yeah, that's fine, thank you. There's nothing that I could say. I just want to reconfirm. Read it. The second document was when your recent document to Lifecycle Assessment for a wind farm just wrapped. Five, six.

00:37:11:28 - 00:37:13:14

Sadly, is done on behalf of the applicant.

00:37:16:00 - 00:37:41:24

Generally, the documents that are certified are those that are referred to in the development consent order. And the reason for the certification is in order that when you come to look at the enforcement and interpretation of the development consent order, that it's clear the documents that you are effectively referring to. So when, for example, the

00:37:43:11 - 00:38:19:10

there's reference in the development consent order requirements to things being in accordance with the environmental statement, there is a copy of the final environmental statement or the environmental statement that can be referred to in terms of understanding where what the parameters were that were assessed, etc., where there's reference to outline codes of construction practice. Again, there is a

document that is recognized as being the definitive one that needs to be in accordance with. So that lifecycle assessment, I'm not aware that we refer to it anywhere in the development consent order or that it's secured through any of the requirements.

00:38:19:20 - 00:38:22:25

So it wouldn't be a document we would be looking to certify at this stage.

00:38:23:08 - 00:38:29:05

Okay. Thank you. That makes sense. So and the next document would be the

00:38:30:24 - 00:38:35:27

the as special effects and final broker. To wrap for O2 seven.

00:38:36:26 - 00:39:00:06

Liz Dunn on behalf of the applicant. Again, this isn't one I think that we would be that we would be looking to certify, I think as we explained I think it was at the December hearing she specific hearing three before Christmas the final proper assessment. Wasn't part of the environmental statement. And it has been done as a as a supplementary piece of work.

00:39:01:25 - 00:39:18:06

So it doesn't form part of the environmental assessment that was submitted. And therefore and again, there isn't say there isn't anything within the draft DCO or that that would that would effectively require adherence to that assessment.

00:39:21:24 - 00:39:40:21

Thank you. And the final one that I have on my list is the outline off shore piling noise monitoring plan, which wraps six, eight, four one. And I note that it is referred to in the new protected provision for call me counsel.

00:39:41:27 - 00:40:10:03

So it's done on behalf of the applicant. I might need to take that one. I have I think again, I think generally. In respect of the protective provisions, documents are typically secured that are referenced in the protective provisions. I need to just check that. I don't think there's an issue with certifying it, but we obviously need to take a consistent approach across any of the other protective provisions in case there are other documents referenced there.

00:40:11:10 - 00:40:13:11

Okay. Thank you. So you'll look into that for us?

00:40:13:26 - 00:40:35:22

Will do. The only other thing I would think that is if it doesn't end up as a certified document, we could be more prescriptive in the protective provisions to confirm which version of that is. So if there's reference to it would say the document dated, whatever it is, in order that it's absolutely clear as to which version of the

00:40:37:09 - 00:40:55:12

the outline vibration noise filing plan it is so that that can we all you know we're everybody's confirmed about that. So I suspect it won't be a certified document but we may well agree a date for that. And then that date will go into the protective provisions to provide that clarity.

00:40:55:27 - 00:40:56:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:40:58:02 - 00:41:01:25

Call me sir. And if any sound that you're happy with that scenario.

00:41:03:24 - 00:41:04:09

Thank you.

00:41:13:11 - 00:41:15:24

One more as well. Crown Land plan.

00:41:20:01 - 00:41:23:24

Lays down a path for the applicant that should be a certified document if it's not in the list.

00:41:25:25 - 00:41:26:10

Thank you.

00:41:29:00 - 00:41:30:15

That. Not on the list, apparently. So, if we can.

00:41:31:06 - 00:41:31:21

Thank you.

00:41:32:14 - 00:41:32:29

Thank you.

00:41:42:24 - 00:41:50:02

Thank you. And it's not the interpretations as well, apparently. So need to be defined in there as well, too. Thank you, Mr. Watson.

00:41:53:09 - 00:41:56:00

Okay. Yes. Mr. Davis.

00:41:57:12 - 00:42:18:29

And we've matured. A child between the banana here. I have my my cookbook PGA tour. You come in my room? Yeah. Is that your r e s, nay or not? So we're IPV domestic, and you should go up there. You have said.

00:42:20:15 - 00:42:25:04

You probably need to have another off the cuff alarm.

00:42:29:21 - 00:42:37:22

Thank you, Mr. Davis. We're talking of the height, the potential height of the potential substations. So the only source is the onshore substation.

00:42:39:19 - 00:42:46:11

So we we come on to that in a couple of questions. Time, if that's okay with yourself. Okay.

00:42:50:17 - 00:42:56:09

Okay, so now move on to requirement to table three.

00:43:05:23 - 00:43:19:12

This table of C details various parameters for the offshore works included the maximum number of wind turbine generators and their maximum height. Is there a need for the maximum height of the wind turbine generators to be included in that table?

00:43:20:23 - 00:43:51:12

So list of half the applicant of you is no but interested. If the examining authority has concerns or thoughts as to why it might, they might need to be. We're happy to sort of discuss those, but from our from the applicant's perspective, the parameters that need to be secured within that, within that table that set the sort of design envelope are clear.

00:43:51:14 - 00:44:23:14

And the hard part is is not one of those. And the examining authority will have noted that in response to the discussions we had, I think at issue specific specific hearing, one regarding the turbines all effectively appearing the same that we added wording to requirement two one to say that obviously subject to any lighting approved under requirements rhythms be no material difference in the size and appearance of the wind turbine generators.

00:44:23:24 - 00:44:36:19

So it's our our view that they don't that those parameters don't need to be included. But if if there are questions or concerns about that, we're happy to to discuss and explain that.

00:44:38:00 - 00:44:45:23

I think that we're asking because I think they were included in other discos like the East Anglia, for example, and also the Olivier.

00:44:47:15 - 00:44:53:22

Specifies the height of the hubs as 174 metres, I think, on some of the visualisation documents.

00:44:55:26 - 00:45:03:27

But also the metrological masters, the heights, the same heights as the hubs. So it was whether that was an issue as well.

00:45:04:14 - 00:45:26:06

So less than a half the applicant in respect of the metrological mast, that will be the same height as the hub height as the hubs because and that is entirely engineering driven in that the metrological mast is there to measure wind speed at hub height. So it will be the same height as the the hops of the turbines.

00:45:28:00 - 00:45:58:14

I don't know the circumstances of other projects, but in other projects where hub heights have been specified, it's often because there is another parameter that needs to be considered. So for example, if there were birds, if there were issues regarding bird collisions or matters like that, and that isn't the case, that isn't the case here. So it is the key parameter that that has been identified for the purposes of of the assessment that was undertaken.

00:45:58:16 - 00:46:08:14

And Ms.. Thompson will explain further is the rotor diameter rather than the hub height for the purposes of establishing the maximum design scenario

00:46:11:06 - 00:46:54:02

or operator. Good morning. Linda Thompson for the applicant. Yes, you're right. And the hub height is mentioned and the maximum design scenario for the offshore turbines. But it was really to get across the point that in the maximum, considering the maximum design scenario for the tallest height

turbines are proposed that 332 metres be considered, that actually the the largest rotor diameter equated to the maximum design scenario. For the reasons explained in the SLV, i.e. that the comparative scale of the rotors compared to the the other existing operational turbines are towards that being the maximum design scenario.

00:46:54:04 - 00:47:08:27

And for that reason, then you want you've got the maximum router diameter. Then you also suggest what that would equate to in terms of the hub height. And that gave us then the the height for the mast that we were considering in that scenario.

00:47:12:09 - 00:47:14:02

Okay. Thank you for that.

00:47:17:03 - 00:47:21:21

Okay. So that was on that one. If I can now pass over to Dr. Morgan, please. For requirement for.

00:47:22:14 - 00:47:52:05

Yes. So turning now to schedule two, requirement for offshore noise, we also noted the submission to our survey outlined offshore pay noise monitoring plan and the protective provisions. DEADLINE six. Can you explain a little bit more detail how they address Conway's comment? Katy Perry counsel's previous concerns about the threshold for offshore construction noise.

00:47:57:10 - 00:47:59:03

Matt, on behalf of the applicants,

00:48:02:23 - 00:48:41:25

I don't think they fully address the difference in in noise levels that that both parties are proposing. As noted in the statement of Common Ground. There hasn't been agreement with Conway County Borough Council and the threshold of the 50 DB, which is currently drafted in the DCO, is the applicant is calculated using the relevant British standard, which is base 5228. There has been good agreement and the monitoring plan itself, which would be used to to undertake continuous monitoring.

00:48:42:27 - 00:48:58:23

I'm pleased to say that that has been agreed, as has other aspects of the noise assessment as reflected in the statement of Common ground. But it is the issue of of the threshold. I think that remains an area of disagreement in terms of the applicant's case.

00:49:02:01 - 00:49:34:15

The threshold that is within the draft each year at the moment has been calculated using base 5228, which is the code of practice for noise, moderation, control on construction and open sites. And that British standard sets out the methodology for predicting noise levels arising from a wide variety of construction related activities, including planning. Compliance with baseline 228 is expected as a minimum standard when assessing the impact of construction noise on the existing noise environment.

00:49:35:21 - 00:50:11:06

And it's the applicant's position that beats by 2 to 8 is the correct standard that should be followed and that the noise threshold is calculated using the ABC method within that standard, within 5 to 8 are the appropriate thresholds to use for this requirement for base five. 2 to 8 is also the British standard that's been used for the only sure noise chapter. Sorry, the Onshore Noise East chapter, which is a AP 071 to assess the potential for significant effect to occur.

00:50:11:21 - 00:50:51:27

The use of s5228 was set out in the EIA scoping report. It was consulted upon by the peer and it was discussed at experts group meetings. And I think it's worth recapping on the results of the noise assessments that was carried out with regard to offshore parking. Two planning scenarios were considered. There was a monopole and a pin pile, so the monopole scenario did not result in significant levels or even significant effects during daytime, evening and nighttime and pin piling did not result in significant effects during daytime or evening time.

00:50:53:00 - 00:51:07:06

During the night time did result in significant effect, but this only occurred at one of the receptors locations and represented a one tb exceedance above that 50 db limit that was taken from baseline to two eight.

00:51:09:00 - 00:51:18:07

The assessment was very precautionary. It considered two findings being driven simultaneously at the closest point of the array to land based receptors.

00:51:20:09 - 00:51:49:28

In addition, the assessment assumed downwind propagation between the source and the receiver. So onshore wind effects and there are a number of other considerations that are useful to mention with regard to offshore ponding noise is anticipated. That scenario where there was simultaneous pinpointing could be undertaken for a total of 25 polling days, so approximately 600 hours of ponding. And that's a very

00:51:51:17 - 00:52:16:00

that's that's that's based on other assumptions that have been used in re mammals and other things in the s and that would take place that that would be 600 hours applied within a 12 month period. But within that period the provided wind is is offshore. A review of five years of meteorological data suggests that onshore winds would only occur for 15 to 20% of the time.

00:52:17:19 - 00:52:33:12

Not opening would occur at that nearest point That's been assessed either you got the rest of the array that would be bit further away from onshore researchers and those considerations would potentially limit that significant effect that was identified from the original statements,

00:52:35:04 - 00:53:12:23

although I can't agree with counsel, agree that the methodology in 5228 has been applied correctly, and that's reflected in the statement of common grounds. The Council does not agree to the resulting level, but that methodology gives a 50 days. A 50 DB can wait. County Borough Council have suggested an alternative. The threshold for use in the DCA requirements. However, it's not considered suitable because it relates to methods for commercial and industrial noise that typically occur at a much longer time scales than construction projects do and relate to a different British standard.

00:53:13:17 - 00:53:46:14

The approach suggested by Conway is usually associated with operational noise from a static plant as set out in press four one for two methods for writing and assessing industrial and commercial sales. And indeed, Section 1.3 appears for one for two states that the standard is not intended to be applied to the rating and assessment of sound from construction and demolition. And so it is not considered an appropriate or suitable measure for deriving the noise threshold in this shared requirement for

00:53:49:13 - 00:54:00:03

although there is not agreement on the noise level. There has been agreement on noise monitoring proposals as a result of discussions with Company County Borough Council during examination.

00:54:02:22 - 00:54:42:18

That noise monitoring plan establishes the principles for continuous monitoring of offshore construction noise and is generated as submitted at deadline six. The monitoring plan also includes proposals for communications with local residents in the standard low area, and the aim of that communication plan is making sure that local residents would be aware that Parliament would be taking place when it will take place. How long would it take place? For the duration of those works and therefore would help to reduce the likelihood of complaints being made through greater awareness of the construction of the offshore elements of what is more.

00:54:44:15 - 00:55:26:00

In summary, we are of the view that the current wording in the share requirement relates to threshold levels that be correctly calculated using the correct British standard appears five 2 to 8 and so should remain at 50 decibels and with the applicant does note that Conway County Borough Council has requested that the definition of tea within that current wording needs to be it needs to be more clearly defined. And so the proposal that Ms.. Dunne mentioned earlier around the wording, the requirement would be to replace T with one hour to make it clear what the averaging period would be, that would be 60 minutes.

00:55:27:07 - 00:55:47:15

We do have my colleague, Mr. Solomon here who undertook the noise assessment and we would be happy to go into further detail if that would be helpful. As to why yes, 5228 has been used, how the thresholds have been calculated and why the proposed approach suggested by Conway County Borough Council is not considered to be appropriate.

00:55:49:06 - 00:56:03:21

Thank you, is very useful. Perhaps your colleague could go into the the application of that pretty standard to this particular context, the offshore planning context, whether it is applicable, whether you could talk to that place.

00:56:05:11 - 00:56:22:14

Hello. Ben Sutton from on behalf of the applicant. Yes, thank you, Matt. Just expanding on why B. S fluctuate, why it has been used for the assessment of party noise. And I'll go into this and apologies if it overlaps with anything that much. Matt already said

00:56:24:10 - 00:56:57:00

B. S fluctuates considered the most appropriate British standard for the assessment of construction noise and is the relevant code of practice approved under Section 71 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 B. S 43. It sets out a methodology for predicting noise arising from a wide variety of construction and related activities, and contains tables of sound levels generated by a wide variety of mobile and fixed plant compliance of 528 is expected as a minimum standard when assessing the impacts of a construction noise upon an existing noise environment at nearby noise sensitive receptors.

00:56:57:22 - 00:57:32:29

B. S 5 to 2. It gives recommendations for basic basic methods of noise control relating to construction sites, including sites for demolition, remediation, ground and ground treatment of related civil engineering Works are being carried out and open sites where work activities and operations generate significant noise levels. The legislative background to noise control is described and recommendations are given regarding procedures for the establishment of effective liaison between developers, site operators and local authorities. B. S 48 provides guidance concerning methods of predicting and measuring noise and assessing its impact on those exposed to it.

00:57:33:21 - 00:57:52:18

In addition, the scope of p B. S 5 to 2. It includes piling noise and associated controls. For example, Section 8.5 relates to noise controls and piloting sites. Table C three In Annex, you provide sound level data on piling on an auxiliary operations. Annex. D describes the types of parking that can be utilised.

00:57:57:15 - 00:58:08:08

Sorry, can you just repeat the paragraph in verse 5 to 2, five, 5 to 8, even that referred to on a note, because I didn't catch that section 8.58.5.

00:58:10:10 - 00:58:32:28

It also noted that specifying threshold noise levels for planning operations in conjunction with 513 has been used as the basis for a EIA on other DCI schemes such as the polling noise assessment for the Swansea Tidal Barrage and in addition 5 to 2, a Section 61 refers to 5228 has been used to derive night time night noise construction thresholds.

00:58:33:00 - 00:58:33:15

For the.

00:58:33:23 - 00:58:49:26

Cook Inlet Forest Wind Farm 2014 East Anglia one North and galloper Wind Farm decodes a conclusion and conclusions Base 5228 does not make specific reference to offshore timing for wind farms is considered the most applicable guidance for the assessment of planning operations in this case.

00:58:54:01 - 00:59:02:01

That's great. Thank you. I think I've heard enough on that. Thank you. Esther Thomas, would you like to respond to the African to. Please.

00:59:04:12 - 00:59:15:28

Thank you. I will, through the chair, ask Mr. Williams to come in first, and then I can address any further concerns if required. Okay. Thank you.

00:59:17:09 - 00:59:19:13

Williams on behalf of Conway County Borough Council.

00:59:21:03 - 00:59:57:23

What the applicant has said is true, that they have done it correctly with the right regards to the right party standard. But as an environmental health officer, my concern and our concern is the fact that any nighttime activity of piling will be much louder than the background noise level, and therefore it will cause somebody to maybe wake up from sleep and they do appear in B and C area with reference to British standard 5 to 2 aides, and

01:00:01:07 - 01:00:20:15

we are allowed to restrict the hours of working, shall we say, of a piling if it was on land. Therefore, we stipulated that you only work and pay between 800,000 and 1800 hours. The proposal here is for the piling to take place over a 24 hour period.

01:00:22:28 - 01:00:44:13

And our concern still is that because of the nature of the impact noise the patent provides, that if you pile for 5 minutes, you will have woken people up and that's it. You know, they've been disturbed by the sleep at 3:00 in the morning. They are going to be very annoyed and they're going to be following people and making contact first thing in the morning.

01:00:46:11 - 01:01:03:18

The idea of trying to set a limit. That fluctuates with the background noise level is that 4142 says anything up to 5 to 5 to be increased on the background is unlikely to have an adverse effect. Therefore it is hope that.

01:01:05:06 - 01:01:39:28

Locals wouldn't be affected by the piling. I think our greatest concern is the night time. And the fact that they will want to be patient for 24 hours. Potentially, and I haven't actually discussed with the applicants. Maybe they'll throw divers up. You know, maybe the DCO could stipulate timings during the day from 8 to 1800 hours and there is no pilot to take place unless there are emergencies, etc., that they may need to finish a pile off and continue till six, 7:00 at night.

01:01:41:04 - 01:02:06:12

But we we still maintain that it is our concern that setting a limit of 50 in the night time, although it has been done, it has been calculated correctly in the rest of it as the limit is great. But as a noise nuisance that somebody can be affected by. We have we still have our concerns and I don't think those those concerns will ever be a go away.

01:02:09:18 - 01:02:13:25

Okay. Thank you. I would the applicant like to respond to what they've said.

01:02:13:27 - 01:02:14:12

Please

01:02:16:08 - 01:02:17:24

vote on behalf of the applicants.

01:02:19:24 - 01:02:52:15

But I think in terms of. Yes, five, two, two, eight. The thresholds that we've used and the threshold that that is in there is a nighttime or is a limit that relates to night time. The ABC method allows you to get thresholds for daytime, evening and night time. So it is a night time limit and it is a night time limit taken from the relevant British British standard. In terms of the comment about restricting partying to just daytime periods

01:02:54:09 - 01:03:04:12

because of the nature of. The prodding vessels that are required and having to undertake.

01:03:06:27 - 01:03:27:15

It's the nature and availability of those vessels. It's the availability of the right weather conditions and right conditions in which to pile. I'm afraid the applicant couldn't accept a restriction just to day time periods. I can probably get somebody to expound on that point more if if that's helpful. But

01:03:29:07 - 01:03:33:23

we couldn't accept a restriction just to the daytime upon him.

01:03:36:02 - 01:03:44:24

I don't think any further information in that regards necessary. I think I understand the issue. I'll just open it up to anyone else who might have a comment.

01:03:47:16 - 01:03:50:22

No. Okay. I'll pass back to Mr. Happy then.

01:03:51:27 - 01:04:03:20

I'm okay. Thank you, Dr. Morgan. I'm conscious of time, but maybe if we just deal with this requirement. The next requirement. Requirement seven. Table four. Just before we break for lunch.

01:04:05:27 - 01:04:06:15

So

01:04:08:16 - 01:04:38:27

this topic, we were discussing inclusion in a maximum building height for the potential our insulator to which get onto your substation. It's been slightly superseded by the submission deadline. Six. But then note on substation building heights, which was Rep 6025. But I wonder if for the benefit of us all, if the applicant could run through that document briefly and also for the benefit of Mr. Davis in terms of the overall building height for both types of substations, are they outlined in that document? Thank you.

01:04:39:06 - 01:05:10:14

Thank you, sir. On behalf of the applicant. So at the hearings in December, we had a discussion and there was a request around, including within requirements seven, which is a one of the requirements in the DCO. It's the requirement in the development consent order that deals with the sort of the parameters of the works that can take place onshore.

01:05:10:21 - 01:06:01:19

And particularly it has specifications for infrastructure. And ultimately, as I'm talking, it has specifications in relation to the parameters of the onshore substation and in the submitted development consent order, the applicant had included. And people will be aware that the option of our insulated switchgear, which involves some buildings, but most of the equipment outdoors and gas insulated switchgear where there's still equipment out doors and other buildings, but there would be a large, large the largest of the buildings that would be required for the substation under the gas insulated switchgear.

01:06:01:21 - 01:06:13:24

We we had included in the development consent order and that particular requirement a maximum building height of 15 metres for the gas insulated switchgear building.

01:06:15:12 - 01:07:05:23

We were asked at the hearings to consider whether there needed to be maximum building heights for the air insulated switchgear buildings, which was reviewed. And in identifying those building heights. It became clear it wasn't quite as simple as saying there should be a single building height for our insulated switchgear buildings as as I've just outlined, there will be a range of buildings within both the gas insulated switchgear arrangement and with an air insulated switchgear arrangement and the two, as well as the large up to 15 meter building that's required for gas insulated switchgear for both options.

01:07:06:09 - 01:07:38:15

There are two different sorts of buildings. There are something called static var compensation buildings. If we want to know what static var compensation is. Mr. Giles Sims Williams, our engineer, is here to explain it, but I think they have racks of equipment in them. There is a static var compensation there to up to two static var compensation buildings in both the air and the gas option. And there are other buildings that will be needed.

01:07:39:27 - 01:08:13:24

And the static var compensation buildings are typically higher than those other buildings. So rather than setting the height of the static var compensation buildings as the maximum building height, we

sought to provide different building heights for different types of buildings. So what has been included in the requirements seven two in relation to those maximum building heights? Is that the static var compensation buildings will be a maximum of.

01:08:16:17 - 01:08:48:16

42.475 meters above ordnance datum. Now, that's not very helpful in terms of understanding what the maximum height of those buildings might be. Generally, that would be a 7.5 meter maximum height for those buildings. But because we've expressed it in the development consent order by reference to above ordnance datum height, that's what's included within the development consent order. And then for all other buildings that which are required, excluding enclosures.

01:08:48:18 - 01:08:55:00

And it's important that that's understood in excluding in enclosures the maximum.

01:08:57:06 - 01:09:16:19

Building height will be 46.67. No, it won't. Sorry. It will be 40.675 metres above audience datum, which would be a maximum building height of 6.5 metres for those other buildings.

01:09:18:12 - 01:09:27:28

I hope that's clear. And the development consent order, the wording in the development consent order has been amended to provide for those those building heights.

01:09:29:19 - 01:09:34:04

Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Dunne. So just so I'm clear. So the static bar

01:09:35:28 - 01:09:40:12

is the same as during the DCO. It's called Reactive Compensation building. Is that the same thing?

01:09:41:02 - 01:09:42:20

So yes, it is the same thing.

01:09:44:09 - 01:09:45:07

Okay. Thank you for that.

01:09:47:04 - 01:09:50:07

The the note the six note explains

01:09:52:03 - 01:10:04:14

that the proposed wording would limit the maximum height of the tallest average light switch scale building to a level higher than the indicative value in the environmental statement and the design principles document.

01:10:06:13 - 01:10:15:05

I know in there you say that this doesn't affect the maximum parameter you use for a healthy eye and heritage assessment. Could you explain that in more detail, please?

01:10:16:25 - 01:10:20:11

Given that stated, the building would be higher than was assessed in that? Yes.

01:10:24:07 - 01:10:59:23

Linda Thompson for the applicant. The maximum design parameter used for the landscaping visual impact assessment is 029 Reflect those in table 14 of the onshore project. Description. Chapter 062 and confirm the maximum design scenario represents the maximum parameter height model of 15.8

metres based on the maximum onshore substation building height of 15 metres, plus an additional point eight metres for the substation platform, which is considered to represent the worst case parameter in line with the Rochdale envelope approach.

01:11:00:16 - 01:11:36:16

This approach, as set out in paragraph 143 of the LPA, which states that in relation to the onshore substation footprint, it should be noted that other elements of external substation infrastructure vary in height. However, because the tallest onshore substation buildings could potentially be allocated anywhere within the onshore substation footprint, the maximum parameter height has been applied to the whole onshore onshore substation footprint to create the LPA Rochdale envelope shown in the LVI visualisations and used set the zone of theoretical visibility calculations.

01:11:37:16 - 01:12:22:10

This results in an overestimation of the height of the model and parts of the onshore substation maximum parameter, but represents the maximum design scenario in terms of assessment. The exception to this would be lightning masts, which due to their slender height and design, are not included in the overall consideration of the maximum infrastructure, height and LV maximum parameters. Therefore, the maximum design scenario uses the height of the gas building to define the maximum parameters for assessment as shown in the visualizations that accompany the LPA, securing a maximum height of 7.5 metres for the attractive compensation buildings and 6.5 metres for other buildings does not affect this maximum parameter as assessed.

01:12:22:24 - 01:12:55:01

And so the findings of the LBB are unaffected. The Rochdale envelope approach that has been followed without the LPA process allows for flexibility of elements such as their scale, mass and position within the defined maximum parameter extent. This approach is recognised as being necessary in developments such as this, since the detailed design of the substation components will not be known until the design has been approved by Denbighshire County Council to discharge the DCO requirement of six, which would not happen for some time after consent.

01:12:56:13 - 01:13:15:07

So it is done on behalf of the applicant. So and the same because the cultural heritage assessment was derived from the landscape and visual assessment. That same maximum building height parameter of 15 metres being applied across the whole site for the purpose of the assessment was used for the Cultural heritage assessment as well.

01:13:17:05 - 01:13:17:24

Okay, thank you.

01:13:19:18 - 01:13:26:20

Would the would it be an implications for the photo montages prepared for the air insulated switchgear buildings?

01:13:34:27 - 01:14:01:21

So the LBA makes it clear that the three dimensional visualisations are provided as example, Views of the indicative GIS and EPS layout are differentiated from the maximum potential visual envelope upon which the API is based. Paragraph 144 of the LP which states the visualizations of the LP maximum design scenario for the onshore substation were provided in Volume six, Annex two.

01:14:03:09 - 01:14:37:24

In order to illustrate the maximum potential visual value of the onshore substation from each of the green viewpoints, example 3D model of both the gas and area substation options have also been included in the visualizations for Viewpoints one. For example, 3D model views provided within the

HPI visualizations have a role in aiding the understanding of the approximate density and form of buildings and other elements that could be located within the maximum parameter extension of the visualizations, i.e.

01:14:37:26 - 01:15:20:14

that it's not the applicant's intention to fill the maximum parameter extent with buildings of up to 50 metres in height. Notably, the LBA maximum design scenario includes provision for the maximum gas building height. Across the larger is 200 by 250 meter footprint print and not being determined where the area of the gas option would be sited within that. Therefore, the maximum parameter assessed and LPA and shown in the visualizations overstates either the maximum height of the buildings and electrical infrastructure or the maximum fine that would be affected depending on whether EIA or GISS selected.

01:15:21:28 - 01:15:41:29

This approach as it allows for the scale, form and position of the buildings and other components to move around within the defined maximum parameter extent as long as they do not exceed them. This approach is considered accepted and necessary due to the early stage of the design process. Does that answer your question, sir?

01:15:45:06 - 01:15:49:04

Thank you. Yes, I think it does. Sergeant Hudson, did you.

01:15:50:11 - 01:16:02:18

I think the question was because the visualizations show the five metres height. Is that correct? So if it's actually 7.5, does that have any implications for the

01:16:04:10 - 01:16:05:08

photo montages?

01:16:06:22 - 01:16:22:25

Linda Thompson for the applicant. It does alter and those indicative layouts within the 4 to 1 montages, but just to confirm so it does not alter the assessment made in the Elvia and those are explicitly stated as being indicative.

01:16:24:23 - 01:16:33:18

Okay. Just one of the quick questions. So if the highest parts of the. JSE building is 49.975,

01:16:35:12 - 01:16:55:22

and that's compared to the highest part for the Air Force. 1.675 is the difference between those two seven and a half meters. In that case, if once if the highest of the J.S. is 15 meters, the difference should be seven and a half meters. And is it this other difference?

01:17:00:26 - 01:17:01:16

Yeah, well.

01:17:22:01 - 01:17:25:01

So done on welfare. How can we have the question again, please?

01:17:27:10 - 01:17:32:14

It's probably it's the Jazz building is 50 meters maximum and that is

01:17:34:05 - 01:17:37:12

49.975 metres 80.

01:17:39:08 - 01:17:43:06

The highest building would be seven and a half metres high as

01:17:44:25 - 01:17:49:08

the lot is half of 50 metres and that's 41.6 over five. So.

01:17:51:01 - 01:17:55:04

The difference between those two numbers would be seven and a half. Is that correct?

01:18:01:11 - 01:18:16:07

We will check those, but we think it's because of the finished floor level difference of the point eight meters so that the gas, the maximum parameter is actually modeled at 15.8. Although the building itself would have a maximum height 15.

01:18:17:09 - 01:18:19:19

Okay. That makes sense. Thank you.

01:18:24:03 - 01:18:39:15

Okay. Thank you. Just one more question, and that was obviously, we've heard about the reactive compensation building. What kind of matting will we be talking about in terms of the actual compensation building? I suppose my question is the

01:18:41:01 - 01:19:05:17

original switch gears company argue just a larger footprint, but lower heights of visibility first in comparison to the gas insulated scenario of smaller footprint, but taller, more solid structures. So we have an air insulated switchgear with a large footprint and a fairly tall building of a significant mass potentially. Is that not combining the most visible elements of both designs?

01:19:58:21 - 01:20:15:18

Linda Thompson for that. Just to reinforce that the dimensions given, I think you might be referring to the maximum design scenario and indicative dimensions that are set out, then LV II and then the, the and

01:20:17:25 - 01:20:19:16

the project Description START

01:20:21:11 - 01:20:42:00

chapter. So in table six of the maximum design scenarios, it does mention some indicative dimensions for the buildings. And given they are indicative, I think we're maintaining that they are still indicative, but they would potentially also apply to taller buildings.

01:20:43:25 - 01:20:44:10

Right.

01:20:47:18 - 01:21:09:27

So I think just to reiterate the point Miss Thompson made, that the assessed the the Elvia assessment that was undertaken was on the basis of that 15 meter building across the whole of the gas substation site and therefore is considered to be that worst case for the purposes of the assessment.

01:21:16:05 - 01:21:46:13

Okay. Thank you. That makes sense, I suppose. Your the note on subsection height refers to that is a more recent development. The example is given to try and know that your manufacturers are

standardizing with taller stacks of reduced area. So the taller stacks, presumably the results in this this building height that you've given us for, they are insulated. So do you have any indications of the potential massing of that building in terms of volume or whipsaw?

01:21:59:10 - 01:22:20:21

Charleston on behalf of the applicant. I'm being I'm reliably informed that if the if it is the case that if if the equipment is being stacked higher than the base footprint of that building would be smaller because effectively you're putting the same amount of equipment into a smaller footprint, but a but a slightly smaller building.

01:22:21:03 - 01:22:26:03

Thank you. That makes sense. Mr. Davis, would you like to come in on on this issue?

01:22:26:18 - 01:22:27:07

Yeah. From our.

01:22:29:12 - 01:22:57:17

Yeah, I'm aware of this. I'm pushing costs around, but I really doubt the control of one of these adequate and thus taking up the lofty pushing costs. Amount of stuff in quantity at Bennigan's to the best mark after increasing your cost. I'm not claim of salary, save or nay or theory, but the proving great and an ecosystem. Yeah. Hello.

01:23:00:02 - 01:23:22:13

Thank you, Mr. Davis. The the requirement that we're discussing at the moment, in effect, that that is like a condition that you'd get on a planning permission. So the, the upper levels that are stated in here for the two different designs of substation would be set within the develop consent order, which is effectively like the Planning Commission.

01:23:25:04 - 01:23:27:00

If the developed consent order were to be granted.

01:23:29:01 - 01:23:50:23

Does that answer your question or do you have any other points? No. Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Probably now is a good time to break for lunch and we'll recommence after lunch on requirement nine. So if we take, say, 45 minutes and we recommence at 1:30. Okay. Thank you very much, everyone.