



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 3
Date:	18 September 2024

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

Five Estuaries_Wivenhoe_18 Sept_ISH1_PT3

Created on: 2024-09-18 12:40:52

Project Length: 01:24:36

File Name: Five Estuaries_Wivenhoe_18 Sept_ISH1_PT3

File Length: 01:24:36

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:06 - 00:00:14:07

The, uh, the time is 145, so, um, we can recommence this hearing.

00:00:16:21 - 00:01:07:01

So continuing with, uh, matters of navigation and shipping, um, hopefully everybody will be pleased to know that, uh, thanks to the helpful submissions that we received from, uh, the applicant, uh, the MCA, uh, and the Port of London Authority, uh, I've been able to be crossing out a number of, uh, the questions that I might have had, um, around elements of the, uh, navigational risk assessment methodology, um, and assumptions that I was going to ask IPS, I think, um, it's, uh, clear to see where, uh, MCA and Portland and Authority are um, but I do have, um, a few questions for the applicants.

00:01:07:05 - 00:01:39:07

Uh, team, um, just really to to help the QA understand a little bit more about the, um, shipping issues. Um, so starting with, uh, vessel traffic movements. Um, I think there's reference at various points in the NRE. Um, I've just jotted down paragraph, um, 792. Uh, so there being 26 main commercial routes, uh, within the study area.

00:01:39:26 - 00:02:19:11

Um, for the arrays with the ports of Amsterdam to Dover Strait via the North Hinder South Traffic separation scheme, CSS being the um cited as the most heavily trafficked. Um, with an average of 30 unique vessels per day. Um, I wonder whether the applicant team could inform the exa. Um, how many commercial routes utilize the sunk, uh, test? Um, and what the average number of unique vessels is per day.

00:02:19:19 - 00:02:27:27

Um, using that route, I don't think I could see a sort of figure for that in the NRA.

00:02:39:00 - 00:02:46:24

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. Just to confirm, you're looking for a number of vessels that use the RTS per day. The sunk is TTS.

00:02:46:26 - 00:02:51:11

Yes. Yeah. That would be that would be helpful.

00:03:08:24 - 00:03:22:10

This month. Westwood for the applicant. We'll have to come back to that figure. I guess the thing with the RTS is a number of routes converge to use it. So it's not a value that we've got to hand, but we can work that out and, and provide it, um, as an action point.

00:03:24:04 - 00:04:01:27

Great. Thank you. I would appreciate that. And I realize it was more than, um, one route, which is what I think why I was struggling to find a figure, but it'd be good. Good to know, given that that's a, uh, you know, an area of interest. So thank you for that. Um, I think sticking with, um, the sort of commercial routing, um, I think around paragraph uh, 796, it summarizes Arises that the maximum deviation to a route as a result of the five estuaries arrays.

00:04:02:10 - 00:04:41:24

Would be an increase of 2.7 nautical miles. I think a slightly different figure for the sort of cumulative impact, but, um, I'll just settle on the 2.7 nautical miles for the route between the ports of Grimsby and the port of Zeebrugge. Um, I appreciate this might be a sort of broad figure, but, um, could the applicant just give the Xa, um, a rough idea of how much, um, a 2.7 nautical mile increase in route length might equate to in terms of time added to a route

00:04:43:12 - 00:04:43:27

for.

00:04:49:00 - 00:05:18:20

Smith Westwood for the applicant. So as you will see in table 15.4. We actually give a percentage increase of the route, which is 1.1. 4%. We're not able to really give a time, given that vessels on that route will all travel at a different speed. So hence why we give the percentage rather than the time. But I think it's fair to say, based on other deviations created by other offshore wind farms, that's a fairly low percentage in terms of route length.

00:05:21:00 - 00:05:47:20

Okay. Thank thank you for that. Um, I was also a little, um, curious how the presence of the arrays, uh, resulted in a stated reduction of, uh, one nautical mile to the route between the Port of Hull and the ports of Zeebrugge. Um, presumably, you know, as a result of of rerouting. Um, but I was just a bit surprised that if there was a quicker way to get between those ports, that wouldn't happen already.

00:05:49:13 - 00:06:20:19

This month was offered to the applicant. um, so we do detail within the navigational risk assessment, the methodology we, uh, we use for, um, calculating, uh, routine increases or decreases. And it's not an it's not completely out of the realms of possibility for to be decreased. And it will be given, uh, it will be down to, uh, us finding an alternative, acceptable worst case route for them to take. So it is unusual, but it is what we believe to be a route that they could use.

00:06:20:21 - 00:06:34:02

And note that that route position is that route, um, decrease by departing is calculated on the mean route position of that route. So the, you know, the not the full 90th percentile of traffic, basically.

00:06:36:29 - 00:06:38:19

Thank you for that explanation.

00:06:42:28 - 00:07:05:29

Um, and I don't know whether the applicant team might be able to, uh, get figure uh, 9.5 um, from the um, is volume six, part two, chapter nine, um, reference 078. Upon the upon the screen.

00:07:07:16 - 00:07:08:01

Um.

00:07:10:01 - 00:07:54:11

I think the the essays, um, uh, it's like concern or confusion on on this was um, there's a corresponding table, um, 9.8 um, and that refers to routes for A and for B. Um, but if, when the, the figure appears on screen, um, it only refers to route four, um, rather than an A and B, whereas for some of the other routes, um there is a corresponding a and B, and it clearly matches up between table 9.8 and figure 9.5.

00:07:55:03 - 00:08:16:12

Um, yeah. So it's the root root for um, I don't know if there's a genuine reason for that. Great. But if, um, the figure needs updating, um, so that it marries up a bit, a bit more closely with table 9.8. So that would be great.

00:08:21:24 - 00:08:31:01

This month Westwood for the applicant. So the A and B just note for the northbound and southbound of the traffic. But yes we can update the figure to clarify which is the north and which is the southbound.

00:08:33:17 - 00:08:34:23

That would be great. Thank you.

00:08:40:01 - 00:09:31:23

Um, okay. Just, um, turning to the collision and collision risk modeling work, which is obviously set out in chapter 16 of the NRA um reference app. Um, to 40. Um, obviously that sets out the modeling undertaken, the results in relation to the, um, collision and collision risks resulting from the five estuaries arrays, um, ones. I could, um, uh, could the applicants, uh, team could an attack, um, just provide the Xa with a little bit more background to the, um, Cole risk modeling suite that was used and referred to? Um, you know, I'm assuming, for example, it's recognized industry standard for modeling.

00:09:34:11 - 00:10:09:17

Uh, Samantha Westwood for the applicant. That would be quite difficult, I would say, for me to do in the hearing in terms of giving you the details of that model. But we do have, um, written information we can submit for you to review. As you pointed out there, you know, it is modeling that has been used in multiple offshore navigational risk assessments. And I'm sure the MCO will agree that, you know, they are content with the methodology that it uses, which is in line with the uh, MXN 654 methodology. Um, so but yeah, I think it would probably be easier for me to give you that in writing than to try and do it in a snippet today.

00:10:11:14 - 00:10:21:15

Yeah. Thank you. I thought that would probably be the answer. And that that's fine. A note perhaps by, um, deadline one um, on that background would be very helpful.

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

Um, you probably see from, um, one of our draft written questions, um, that were a little curious, um, regarding the for the array areas, um, the minimum distances of 830m between wind turbine generators and 500m for the offshore substation platforms. Um, and you know how they've been chosen, selected as minimum distances for this project? Um, I'd be interested to know, you know, how these minimum distances compare with other existing or proposed offshore wind farm arrays? Um, and is it based on safety considerations for navigation, search and rescue, um, or other technical considerations? Um, ecology or a combination of all those factors?

00:11:24:14 - 00:11:58:25

Uh, Alice Maynard for the applicant. So the particular figure of uh 830 for this project was calculated as four times the rotor diameter of the minimum, uh, -50m for micro siting. The this distance is a technical distance. Um, because if we put turbines to get closer together, then they get more fatigued and they break the codes and yeah, they don't work. There's too much turbulence. So but this distance, 830m, is bigger than the 500m that we normally have for search and rescue corridor.

00:11:59:17 - 00:12:32:13

Um, blade, which is defined as blade tip to tip. Um, so that's what normally governs. Now the turbines have got bigger in the past, turbines would have been closer together because the rotor limiters were smaller. So that's what governs that one. The 500m is a safety working distance to, um, between the turbines of the substations will be in line with the with the wind turbines, but obviously they're a lot smaller so and shorter. So they don't cause the same sort of disturbance to the wind and fatigue issues with the tower.

00:12:32:21 - 00:12:41:05

So but they'll be in line with that. Um, and it's a safety working distances for vessels that we need to operate the and maintain the substations.

00:12:49:01 - 00:12:51:20

Right. Thank you for that explanation.

00:12:55:03 - 00:13:33:27

Um, just turning briefly to the, uh, navigation corridor safety case. Um, set out in chapter 17 of the NRA. Um, references made in relation to informing the safety case for the navigation corridor, uh, between the Five Estuaries Array and East Anglia to, uh, to a number of third party documents, um marine study, uh, guidance.

00:13:34:02 - 00:13:53:14

Um, obviously. Mhm. Uh Five four. And the coal regs. Um. Could the applicant ensure that these documents or relevant extracts, where appropriate, are, um, submitted to the examination library?

00:13:56:24 - 00:13:58:28

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. Yes, we can do that.

00:14:01:12 - 00:14:02:02

Thank you.

00:14:03:18 - 00:14:06:10

Is that something that could say deadline one?

00:14:07:19 - 00:14:09:20

Yeah. Deadline one's fine. Yeah. Thank you.

00:14:15:18 - 00:15:14:18

Um, obviously before lunch, we we, uh, talked a bit about the, um, export cable corridor. Uh, and the Port of London Authority set out there, um, their case. Um, I just wanted to put the, uh, and obviously we have seen the outline navigation, um, installation plan that submitted. Um, I don't know whether I'm unnecessarily, um, sort of missed it, but it it would be really helpful if you just summarize, um, for me, um, how you sort of intend to maintain safety, uh, during the construction of the, um, export cable corridor where it intersects with the sunken Trinity deep water routes, um, and what might be the expected duration of the time that you do in those, um, activities of, uh, of cable laying, uh, in the deep water routes.

00:15:17:11 - 00:15:53:13

Uh, Alice Maynard for the applicant, uh, the safety of during construction. Um, we sort of have assessed it with two different types of vessels. So there's vessels which, uh, have restricted movement and vessels which are not for restricted movement vessels such as table vessels, because it's connected to the seabed. Then we have defined a concurrent working area, which, uh, has been agreed with the ports and is in discussion with the other parties, such as north walls and ceiling.

00:15:54:00 - 00:16:26:07

It's obviously up for them to agree that. But in that area, there will not be any concurrent activity of restricted movement vessels. Um, so that to allow to ensure that what we have those vessels in that area, it allows the port to sort of navigate and pick other routes and avoid that vessel because they will have a 500 meter clearance zone around it, as is typical for maritime construction safety for the other vessels that we will need. So, um, if there's any seabed, seabed preparation, dredging, um, doing surveys, etc.,

00:16:26:11 - 00:16:55:25

those vessels, uh, have the ability to move out the way. And it's typical, um, it's sort of standard maritime coordination, uh, practices that, uh, will be applied there, which is quite industry standard as our industry standard, uh, approaches to that. Um, but yeah, this has been it's in alignment. It's been agreed with the sort of ports and, uh, we consider that there to be alignment on this issue.

00:17:00:00 - 00:17:10:21

Thank you. And, um, just on the point of the sort of expected duration, um, of works in apologies, vicinity of those deep water routes. Yeah.

00:17:10:23 - 00:17:32:18

So Alice Maynard for the applicant, uh, cable vessels will be just please take this as an indicative order of magnitude. It depends on the type of cable vessel we have. But we'd be talking a few hundred meters an hour. Um, so then if the deep water routes were, say, you know, a few hundred meters long and we've got two cables.

00:17:43:20 - 00:17:45:24

That's great. Thank you. Thank you for that.

00:17:48:24 - 00:18:19:08

Um, and the, um, you mentioned with reference to the outline navigation installation plan that obviously that's a live document. Um, and that it was going to be updated, um, with discussions with various parties, including, uh, Ports of London. Um, is there a sort of indicative timeline or timescale that you've got in mind? Um, for the updating that you referred to?

00:18:21:12 - 00:18:22:11

And your base with the applicant?

00:18:22:13 - 00:18:25:05

Yes. We expect to submit an updated version of deadline one.

00:18:36:23 - 00:18:37:10

Thank you.

00:18:40:12 - 00:19:10:13

Um, and I know that they're not, um, present at the hearing today, but, um, obviously, you'll be aware that, uh, Harwich Haven Authority, um, submitted, um, similarly detailed written representations, um, on similar ish matters to to the Port of London Authority. Uh, and I'm aware that obviously um, the applicant responded, uh, to some of those comments at, uh, procedural deadline day.

00:19:10:28 - 00:19:23:23

Um, but could could I just sort of check that you've got ongoing discussions going on with, um, with HHR? Um, I don't know whether there's anything else you wanted to say about it at this present time.

00:19:25:13 - 00:19:32:06

Uh, just say yes. We, we have ongoing discussions with Harwich Haven Authority and will continue to engage with them on the Nipp and other matters.

00:19:35:08 - 00:19:36:05

Right. Thank you.

00:19:37:24 - 00:20:18:15

Um, and I think the the only other thing that I just wanted to raise at this stage before I turn to see whether, um, either colleagues or, um, any IPS have got any further comments that they want to make. Um, is just to check with the applicant. Again, going back to our draft questions. Um, you'll no doubt

have noted that we've, um, requested, um, ideally a sort of single plan that sets out all the key navigational features so that we can kind of see them alongside each other to, to assist the Xa to understand.

00:20:19:00 - 00:20:27:12

Um, is is is that, uh, is that something that's doable? I appreciate there's probably possibly different scales, but, uh.

00:20:29:19 - 00:20:41:25

It's Samantha Westwood for the applicant. Yes, we're able to do that, as you said. You know, it's quite a wide area that we're referencing. So whether it'll be one figure or two figures, I'm not sure. But yes, we'll definitely submit something in line with the question.

00:20:44:00 - 00:21:11:22

Or it might assist that if we had one plan, albeit that we appreciate, the stuff would be quite small scale on it, but at least it will show it in small. And then, uh, another plan, perhaps spread over several sheets, that shows the features in the perhaps slightly more easier form to read. It's just that when we've been looking at the NRA, it's been quite difficult to work out where all these various navigational areas and the pilot building stations are relative to one another.

00:21:14:09 - 00:21:25:21

Samantha Westwood for the applicant. Yes. Understood. Um, it will be based around figure 7.4 of the NRA. But yes, we can certainly make it a better scale so that you can see what we're looking at and how things are spaced apart.

00:21:29:04 - 00:21:54:00

Right. Thank you. Well, I think I think that's come to the end of my, um, abbreviated list of questions that I had at this initial stage. Um, before I close this agenda item, um, was there anything further that, um. Um, I'll start with the NCA. Anything further that you wanted to say at this time in relation to navigation and shipping.

00:21:56:00 - 00:22:01:03

On Jackson's for the NCA? Uh, no. Nothing further from the Maritime Agency. Thank you.

00:22:01:25 - 00:22:12:08

Thank you. Um, and, um, Mrs. Fowler, for the Port of London Authority. Was there anything in the final comments you wanted to make or miss?

00:22:12:10 - 00:22:12:25

Uh, Mrs..

00:22:12:27 - 00:22:17:18

Vicki Fowler, on behalf of the Port of London Authority. No, sir. We we have no further comments.

00:22:19:19 - 00:22:20:09

Thank you.

00:22:22:21 - 00:22:30:14

And just to check, the applicant didn't have any final comments they wanted to make regarding this item. Okay.

00:22:33:00 - 00:22:57:11

That's great. Well, um, in which case, um, I will hand over to, uh, my colleague Miss Norman, who's going to be dealing with, um, effects for landscape, visual and seascape. But again, perhaps if we, um, just have a couple of minutes so that people can, um, move from the table and back to the table.

00:22:58:20 - 00:23:07:06

I think it's also worth saying that if the MCA, for instance, or PLA want to leave, that's fine. Um, nobody will take any offense.

00:23:12:01 - 00:23:17:11

Actually, I've just spotted that some. Somebody got a hand up online. Um.

00:23:18:02 - 00:23:18:17

Got it.

00:23:20:04 - 00:23:39:18

It's. Good afternoon, Sir Sarah Marshall for National highways. Um, we we've rejoined um, and Mr. Bloom and I were were wondering about the likelihood of the transportation agenda and agenda item seven being reached this afternoon, and I know there's a little bit of guesswork. Um.

00:23:42:09 - 00:23:43:15

I'm in your hands, sir.

00:23:45:14 - 00:24:09:08

We we did have a discussion about this over lunch as to what we thought the prospects were of arriving at transport this afternoon. I think the general consensus view was we probably wouldn't. Um, and I think on that basis, as you asked the question, I think, again, we can stand you down for this afternoon. Um, but we will definitely be dealing with it tomorrow morning.

00:24:09:12 - 00:24:19:10

Yeah. Thank thank you, sir. Um, very much appreciated. Thank you. So, as my Mr. Bloom and I will, we'll leave, but. Yeah. Thank you. We'll see. See you tomorrow morning.

00:24:20:27 - 00:24:21:12

Yes, sir.

00:24:22:29 - 00:24:25:06

I can see another hand raised.

00:24:38:28 - 00:24:47:07

Do you want to make an observation? Or are you getting ready for the for the visual impact section, which we are coming to?

00:24:48:00 - 00:25:19:20

Yeah. Simon Amstell, on behalf of the Suffolk and Essex coast and national landscape. I'm sorry you went quiet. I think when you're asking me a question there. Um, just on the, uh, the navigation, I've just wondered whether the, uh, the applicant had a view on the commercial routing. If there was any changes there that would bring more vessels closer to the Suffolk coast and, uh, the national landscape itself. I've only really just picked up on that thinking, so.

00:25:20:18 - 00:25:24:13

Any, um, understanding of that would be helpful to me.

00:25:28:22 - 00:25:32:07

Find your base for the applicant. Uh, no. No, that's not expected.

00:25:36:24 - 00:25:56:17

Thank you. Um, also possibly conscious that perhaps some of the local authorities, particularly Essex, and suffer if you've got any highway witnesses that might want to be stood down for the rest of the afternoon. I think it's appropriate that we we indicate that they they can be stood down if they wish to go off and do something else.

00:25:57:06 - 00:26:00:03

Thank you sir. That's very helpful. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council.

00:26:06:21 - 00:26:23:15

Thank you. Is everyone ready? Yep. Okay, so we turn to agenda item 3.4, which is a fix for landscape, visual and seascape. Um, and as we've gone with the other items, if the applicants team wish to make a, um, a summary of its case, I'll hand over to you. Thank you.

00:26:36:20 - 00:27:10:00

Good afternoon. I'm Jill Phillips, I'm a landscape architect with open part of Essilor, and I'm responsible for the landscape and visual impact assessment for the five series onshore components. So in response to question A regarding site selection and alternatives, the applicant is considered alternative options for siting infrastructure and methods of construction operations and maintenance and decommissioning from the scoping phase through to DCO submission.

00:27:10:09 - 00:27:50:14

These options have been assessed for community and environmental impact. The applicant cites the site selection and alternatives chapter. Reference app Dash 066 describes the iterative process that has been followed for alternatives assessment to date. This has included nine stages which are set out in the chapter. It is important to note that whilst the site selection process is described as a linear process, the reality of any project development is that site selection is a complex iterative process requiring consideration of multiple factors to reach a decision

00:27:52:09 - 00:28:35:15

in terms of onshore alternatives and focusing firstly on grid connection location. Following establishment of the array boundary at stage one. The next step in the site selection process was the identification by National Grid of a preferred grid connection point for the project. An offer was presented to the applicant for a connection to an East Anglia Coastal 400 kV substation, which was ultimately signed in November 2020. This new substation is now known as the proposed National Grid Norwich to Tilbury reinforcement project and the associated East Anglia Connection node, which we referred to as SSN substation.

00:28:38:22 - 00:29:15:15

On receiving the revised connection offer. The applicant moved the site selection process for onshore infrastructure from Suffolk to the Tendring Peninsula in Essex. The DCO application therefore proceeds on the basis of the project, connecting to a National Grid substation on the Tendring Peninsula in Essex. Once National Grid identified the refined search area for the ECN substation, the applicant then planned to identify onshore export cable corridors and the new substation location in the vicinity of the ECN.

00:29:15:17 - 00:30:00:21

Taking into account onshore environmental constraints. Two key drivers for the location of the landfall zone were the location of the grid connection of the area, and the location of the array areas. As these locations dictate, the relevant stretch of coastline along which a landfall can be feasibly sited to accommodate a connection point between the two once a feasible stretch of coastline was apparent, further constraints, mapping and assessment was undertaken to identify potential landfall zones for evacuation, avoiding as far as possible areas with significant ecological designations along the coast, significant landscape, and archaeological designations.

00:30:00:23 - 00:30:31:17

The presence of coastal settlements and or other coastal development referenced section 4.8 of the Applicant Site Selection and Alternatives chapter reference app Dash 066. This provides greater detail of the types of constraints assessed. The landfill zone was further refined through Peer and ES following stakeholder consultation and design studies.

00:30:32:06 - 00:31:06:06

In particular, impacts to Holland Haven Marshes SSI were minimised through refinement and following extensive site selection work with North Falls Offshore Wind Farm. A joint landfill location was selected with North Falls Offshore Wind Farm in summer 2023 at Sandy point, which lies between Frinton on Sea and Holland on Sea. Moving on to the onshore cable route. Site selection. It was not possible to identify defined locations for five estuaries.

00:31:06:08 - 00:31:38:04

Transmission infrastructure until National Grid had identified more accurately the location for their new ECN substation. Therefore, an onshore infrastructure area of search was identified for use at scoping. Consultation with stakeholders continued prior to scoping. Once National Grid had identified its refined searching area in the vicinity of the existing Lawford substation, the applicant was then able to identify viable substation search areas.

00:31:38:06 - 00:31:52:06

At this stage, the applicant explored opportunities to coordinate with North Pole's offshore wind farm. This included identifying an onshore cable route that would be wide enough for the two projects.

00:31:54:24 - 00:32:28:05

A black red amber green, which referred to as a brag assessment was used, was carried out um of the identified options to compare the environmental Mental engineering, land management and cost constraints and opportunities of each option. Further details of the assessment are available in section 4.12 of the Applicant Site. Search and alternatives. Chapter reference EP 066. A number of refinements were made to further reduce potential impacts.

00:32:28:07 - 00:33:01:08

One of the key technical constraints was the identification of the affinity water main. It was concluded that a single onshore cable route segment option would be included within the stage one public consultation. This was held between the 30th of June and the 12th of August 2022, following consultation feedback. Further design work and concern over the proximity proximity of route segment. Northwest one to Tendring segment northwest one was dropped.

00:33:01:27 - 00:33:03:06

Route segments.

00:33:03:08 - 00:33:03:24

East.

00:33:05:04 - 00:33:40:06

Room alternative North and East IWM alternative to the South were taken forward as the preferred combined onshore cable route. The onshore cable route was then refined in response to further consultation feedback, updated site surveys and in coordination with North Falls. A key technical requirement for the location of the applicant's onshore substation was for it to be within approximately three kilometres, with a maximum of five kilometres from the grid connection point, to minimise the length of the 400 kV connection.

00:33:40:27 - 00:34:18:04

Once National Grid had identified its refined search area in the vicinity of the existing Longford substation, the applicant was then able to identify viable substation search areas in order to identify the most appropriate location to site the applicant's onshore substation. National grid's guidelines on substation siting and design, also known as the Horlock Rules, were taken into consideration. These guidelines document National Grid's best practice for the consideration of relevant constraints associated with the sighting of electricity network infrastructure.

00:34:18:06 - 00:34:58:20

The Horlock Rules have been considered as part of the development of the onshore substation relating to design, local context and land use, amenity and line entry for LVI. In accordance with the rules, the onshore substation location is sited away from built up areas, helping to minimise impacts on visual and noise receptors. It also avoids all landscape destinations including the Dedham Vale AoNB. It ensures the majority of the existing landscape features, such as trees and hedgerows, are protected and takes advantage of screening provided by existing trees in hedgerows along Grange Road.

00:34:59:03 - 00:35:31:11

The layout around The onshore substation has included sufficient space for the screening of views through planting, as required by the Horlock Rules. As a result of this option development and evaluation process, three substation search areas were identified within the non-statutory public consultation in the summer of 2022 at pier. Two of the three search areas were combined, leaving two search areas. Site selection refinements. The substation location for the final is included.

00:35:31:13 - 00:36:08:03

Selection of a single substation location north of Ardley Road and adjacent to National Grid's proposed ECN substation. Coordination between the projects and co-location of the applicants and North Pole substations will result in a slightly reduced overall intake, compared to two individual substations located in different areas. It allows for opportunities to co-ordinate designs potentially share temporary and permanent access rules, and coordinate landscape mitigation principles to further reduce impacts on the surrounding area.

00:36:08:29 - 00:36:14:03

Moving on to site selection with regard to offshoring. And yeah.

00:36:19:06 - 00:36:19:21

I.

00:36:24:05 - 00:36:24:27

Wanted you sure.

00:36:26:12 - 00:37:00:27

Okay. It's fine. Um, offshore re the sighting of the offshore array as part of the Crown Estates extensions round was necessarily limited by needing to be adjacent to the galloper boundary. The site was confined by Greater Gabbard offshore wind farm to the west of galloper. Whilst the traffic separate scheme separates the arrays of both Gabbard and Galloper, providing further constraint following environment constraints analysis which included considering ecology, shipping and other infrastructure to array areas to the east of caliper were identified following scoping.

00:37:00:29 - 00:37:32:26

Further analysis of survey data alongside stakeholder engagement was undertaken, which concluded that a refinement of the northern Array boundary would be required to address shipping and navigation concerns. As such, the northern boundary of the region was realigned to minimise displacement of heavily trafficked shipping routes and generally increases sea room. This reduction has also had benefits for SLV, by reducing lateral spread of turbines and increasing the visual gap between East Anglia two and five estuaries.

00:37:33:16 - 00:38:08:28

Finally, in the section looking at the export cable corridor, following identification of the connection location and landfall zones and export cable corridor, Area of Search was identified following initial constraint mapping within this area of search. A number of EAC options were identified following a range of design parameters, as well as the Crown Estates cable route protocol and stakeholder

engagement. The final EQ was then identified following further detailed analysis and using refined landfill zone.

00:38:09:16 - 00:38:29:19

This analysis included consideration of cable crossings, water depth, avoidance of nonrecourse pilot boarding, and other shipping constraints. Further minor refinements to the EQ were made between scoping and peer and following peer. An area of the IC closest to the sunk pilot boarding station was removed. Thank you.

00:38:34:15 - 00:38:46:24

Thank you very much. And that was helpful. Um, are there any, um, other interested parties who wish to speak at this point? I've got, uh, Mr. Amster. Do you wish to come in now?

00:38:50:18 - 00:38:55:07

Not very much. Sorry. So Julian Boswell for the applicant.

00:39:00:14 - 00:39:10:17

That that I regret to inform you as only little, eh. So there's there's b, c and D, so unless you want to split it up, you need to keep going, I'm afraid. Sorry.

00:39:10:19 - 00:39:50:12

That was my process. Having a bit of a breather. Right. Here we go. And so B the question on the design for the proposed onshore substation, whether you're insulated or gas insulated, the onshore substation will use either air insulated switchgear known as Ise or gas insulated switchgear technology, known as GIS. The consenting strategy to include both option options allows flexibility and detailed design to evaluate the design options with stakeholders. The choice of Ise or GIS will be part of the detailed design process, and the decision will be made post consent and prior to construction commencing.

00:39:50:24 - 00:40:23:17

The choice of Switchgear affects both the total land area required and the size and type of buildings which will be needed. However, having both options in the DCO allows the flexibility for options such as the use of AIS substations, but with the placement of the switchgear in buildings for aesthetic noise impact and technical reasons. The project has outlined the design principles in EP 234. These design principles will be applied in the detailed design process.

00:40:23:22 - 00:41:01:13

In addition to this, the decision making shall engage with the stakeholders through the Onshore Substation Liaison Group which includes Essex Council, North Wales and National Grid. Topics for the detailed design can include within reason, the layout and planting and color palettes. It is noted by the applicant that North Poles has committed to Ace. There is a strategic difference between the projects and this has been raised during the joint review by the Design Council. The focus of the Design Council evaluation related to the assumption that GIS would include SF six, which is being phased out.

00:41:01:26 - 00:41:33:13

The market is currently developing SF six three switchgear and options, where very small amounts of SF six is only contained in the circuit breakers. Retaining this option into detailed design allows the applicant to ensure the best technological options to reduce impacts may be considered. The applicant's onshore substation will contain a number of elements including electrical equipment, control and welfare buildings, lightning protection rods if they're required, and internal road access.

00:41:33:15 - 00:42:16:27

A security fence will surround the onshore substation compound. The larger structure within the onshore substation will be the onshore substation building, with a maximum height of 15m above existing ground level, and that is assuming a GIS design is used, all other equipment is designed not to exceed a height of 15m above existing ground level, with the exception of slender lightning mass, which would be up to 18m in height. The maximum height of the GIS buildings and the maximum IES footprint have been used to form the LV Rochdale envelope, and this is used to ensure the maximum parameters of the onshore substation are assessed.

00:42:17:14 - 00:42:44:19

It should be noted that the components of the AIS and GIS options have different heights, and as their locations are not fixed, the maximum height of 15m has been applied to the and full extent of the onshore substation footprint. In terms of design. There is limited scope for the design of the infrastructure as it has to meet technical and safety standards, but there is scope in the application of colour and we will explore that at post consent.

00:42:51:13 - 00:43:27:23

Good afternoon. I'm Simon Martin. Um, I'm a chartered landscape architect, uh, working with openness, part of SLR consulting, and I'm leading on the seascape and landscape and visual matters. So I'm going to cover point C and D, uh, on the agenda in terms of our summary of case. Um, so point C was in relation to Natural England's representations on seascape, the seascape and visual impact assessments undertaken in section 10.18, which is at 079, um, they follow guidance and the approach taken on, uh, recent inset projects.

00:43:28:07 - 00:44:01:25

Um, there's agreement with interested parties that the the assessment methodology is appropriate and robust in accordance with professional guidance. The applicant's assessment is that the five Estuaries Array areas will not have significant adverse impacts on the natural beauty and special qualities of the Suffolk coast and AoNB. And that the statutory purposes for designation of the RMB will not be compromised. East Suffolk Council and Sussex County Council agree with these conclusions.

00:44:01:27 - 00:44:40:29

However, there is an area of outstanding disagreement with Natural England who have advised in their representations that there would be significant effects on the AoNB special qualities, and that five estuaries would would potentially compromise. The purpose of designation for Natural England in their relevant representation. Appear to use an overly mathematical or quantitative approach based on the vertical field of view, or the apparent height of the closest wind turbines to arrive at a judgement on significance which has limited no basis in in guidance or accepted practice.

00:44:41:18 - 00:44:58:15

Judgements and judgements on significance should properly be based on the assessment material provided in the US, and particularly the photo montages, which are figures 10.26 to 10.46 as app 204 to app 224.

00:45:01:14 - 00:45:43:24

The array areas are located 37.3km from the closest point of the OMB. Most of the wind turbines are actually located beyond 40km, and that's shown in figure 10.6 of the of the. Yes, that's app 199. Significant landscape and visual effects at distances over 37km would really be unprecedented for offshore wind farms. Um, and in our view would be wholly disproportionate. The assessments undertaken found that the impacts on views and the spatial qualities of the RMB coastline are likely to be moderate and minor at worst, and they are not not significantly adverse.

00:45:44:03 - 00:46:22:24

And this is agreed with other interested parties such as the, uh, the district and county councils in Suffolk. The applicant considers its already minimised harm to the special qualities of the AoNB, providing reasonable mitigation within the project design, and that's in line with NPS and one. The applicant has shown regard to the statutory purpose of the AoNB and sought to further its purposes, insofar as possible, around the various siting and operational and viability constraints, um, and to avoid compromising the purposes of designation, which is to conserve and enhance natural beauty in line with NPS.

00:46:22:26 - 00:46:23:17

In one,

00:46:25:04 - 00:47:16:17

the applicant has cited the Ouray area to the eastern side of the existing Greater Gabbard and Galloper Offshore wind Farms. The large separation distance of over 37km from the OMB. At its closest point, it's reduced the spatial extent of the Ouray area, limiting the northern lateral spread of the wind turbines when viewed from the coast, and reduce the maximum height of the wind turbines from 424m to 399m above that, leading to a reduction in the zone of visibility and the apparent height of wind turbines when when viewed, the maximum wind turbine height is also planned to be further reduced to 370m above that two blade tip due to mod requirements, which will result in further reduction in seascape and visual effects.

00:47:17:10 - 00:47:56:23

As a result, the effect of the Five Estuaries Array areas on the special qualities of the AoNB is, as has been assessed, not significant, and the statutory purposes of designation of the OMB will not be compromised. And just to also cover a point D on the agenda, which was the difference in scope effects associated with the development of 41 larger turbines, compared to 79 smaller turbines. The SVA assesses the effects of the 41 turbine large um turbine layout, which is 309m above flat as a maximum design scenario.

00:47:56:28 - 00:48:18:05

That's in accordance with the rotational envelope approach of assessing the effects of a likely worst case scenario wireline showing the 79 smaller wind turbine layout will work produced to inform the

assessments, and will be submitted at procedural deadline one. Just sorry. Deadline one to allow comparison of the layouts.

00:48:19:25 - 00:48:30:01

The applicant considers that the effects of the 79 smaller wind turbine layout are of lower magnitude, due to the smaller apparent height of the the 324 metre turbines.

00:48:31:26 - 00:48:39:29

The XV, the zone of visibility of the 79 smaller turbines, also covers a smaller geographic area, and then the larger turbine

00:48:41:15 - 00:49:00:01

and the 79 smaller wind turbine layout would result in some resulting a greater number or overall number and density of wind turbines in the array, and there would be a greater number of smaller turbines in the the visible visible in the gap on the horizon between Gallup or in East Anglia to

00:49:01:18 - 00:49:26:06

um, just to finish, um and conclude the 79 smaller wind turbine layout will reduce the magnitude of effects, but it is unlikely to change the effects below the thresholds already assessed for the larger wind turbine layout in the year. These effects are already assessed as generally being of low magnitude and no greater than, moderate or minor in, and not significant in terms.

00:49:33:27 - 00:49:49:28

Thank you very much. I'm not jumping in too soon now. Oh. We did. Thank you. Thank you. That was really helpful, actually. I think probably covered a lot of the questions I've got prepared. But if we hear from Mr. Amster now, um. And then we'll take it from there. Thank you.

00:49:52:11 - 00:50:24:15

Simon, I'm representing the Suffolk and Essex coast. News, national landscape, the brand for the Suffolk coast and he's OMB and I'm representing the partnership. And I also work at the Dedham Vale National Landscapes. I will also be talking on behalf of that partnership as well. So I think we can, um, uh, welcome the site selection of the, uh, substation with a couple of caveats around.

00:50:24:18 - 00:51:07:15

Without the detailed design, we can't fully assess the impacts upon the Dedham Vale national landscape. So I think there's still some work to be done on that assessment there. I think also there is concern within the partnership about the, um, construction of the, uh, of that substation and the impacts upon the Dedham Vale national landscape. Um, particularly in terms of, um, some of the defined qualities around tranquility, uh, including use of light, uh, and, um, additional traffic that may need to come through the national landscape.

00:51:07:21 - 00:51:10:22

I've not seen the detail on that yet.

00:51:12:18 - 00:51:47:10

Um, moving on to, um, the further points that were made, there is obviously I think there's a, an agreed positional difference between, uh, um, the applicant and Natural England, um, and the, the National Landscape Partnership would um. uh, defer to Natural England as the government's advisers on arms around their assessment. And I think we would concur with, um, some of the, uh, the findings in their relevant representations.

00:51:47:12 - 00:52:22:00

So I think that's our 081. And I'd make a further point that, as I understand it, the, um, much of the design work was done before the strengthened duty on statutory authorities, um, relating to arms came into force. That came into force in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act of 2023. And we did hear the term, uh, seek to further the purpose by statutory authorities, which I welcome.

00:52:22:09 - 00:52:38:13

Um, and I'd like to see some, um, understanding of how, um, the proposals have changed Change from pay regard through to to seek to further the purpose thing that would be helpful for us.

00:52:40:18 - 00:53:17:07

Um, I and I was the last thing I thought I would say is around the, um, you know, building back up on what Natural England have said in their, uh, relevant representations. 081 uh, around impacts upon the, uh, national landscape that day, when be the Suffolk coast and OMB is that, um, you know, I think we would see a additional curtailing effect of turbines, um, when viewed from certainly some parts of the coast.

00:53:17:09 - 00:53:45:04

So there is a concern there. And I would yeah. When we, when the final, um, design is uh, design proposals are put forward, I think we would need. I think it would be helpful to see that assessed. Um, um, because I think there's still some details to be, to be, um, ascertain there. So thank you very much.

00:53:49:22 - 00:53:54:27

Thank you very much, Mr. Armstead. Um, is there anyone in the room who wishes to make any comments?

00:53:56:23 - 00:53:59:10

Yes. Oh, sorry. Yeah. Mr. Roger.

00:54:00:21 - 00:54:15:07

Oh. Good afternoon. I was just came to council. Um, as I said, um, earlier on in the hearing sessions, my landscape architect isn't with us today, so it wouldn't be opportune for me to, um, uh, raise comments on their behalf, but I think it's, um.

00:54:15:17 - 00:54:17:27

It's correct to say that obviously landscape impact.

00:54:17:29 - 00:54:18:15

In particular.

00:54:18:17 - 00:54:20:03

With regard to the substation.

00:54:20:05 - 00:54:24:01

On its own view, at its own and also in combination with others. Um.

00:54:24:27 - 00:54:25:12

It's going to.

00:54:25:14 - 00:54:26:21

Be a crucial thing for.

00:54:26:23 - 00:54:27:08

Us.

00:54:27:10 - 00:54:27:25

We will.

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

Be making.

00:54:28:14 - 00:54:29:28

Those points to our local impact reports and.

00:54:30:00 - 00:54:37:08

Obviously we could raise this again. Should you have any additional questions to ask us at that time, either at the hearing or in writing? Thank you.

00:54:39:23 - 00:54:42:06

Thank you. Um, Mr. Bedford.

00:54:44:01 - 00:55:25:22

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Um, madam, first, like the Essex County Council, we're intending to set out our full assessment in our local impact report. Uh, and so I'm not intending this afternoon to, uh, rehearse what may be dealt with more fully there. Uh, but I think there are three points just to highlight, uh, at this stage. First, um, we have noted, obviously, the recent, uh, helpful, uh, suggestion by the applicant that in response to, um, operational concerns raised by the Ministry of In defence.

00:55:25:24 - 00:56:14:00

It is being proposed through the proposed change application, that the maximum height of the WGS in relation to the larger scale proposal would be reduced from 3.99m to 3.70m. But what we would certainly welcome some dialogue with the applicant on is to what extent that proposal is going to be supported by further visual assessment work to enable us to fully understand its implications.

00:56:15:26 - 00:56:50:10

And that doesn't necessarily mean that there needs to be a complete, as it were, redoing of that part of the Environmental statement, but I think we would welcome having some dialogue with the applicant as to what parts are particularly sensitive to that degree of change. And it bears on the second point that I want to raise, which is captured, um, in effectively your item 3.4 D that say the difference between the two turbine scenarios.

00:56:50:29 - 00:57:11:01

Uh, because in very crude terms, you've got a difference in quantity versus a difference in height. And with the suggested change, the, uh, as it were, the magnitude of the difference in height is being reduced.

00:57:12:26 - 00:57:43:26

But the difference between the quantity of turbines remains the same. And again, it's understanding the interplay between those as to whether it would remain the case, that the worst case outcome would still be less but taller turbines. And that may very well be the case, but I think we need to see that, as it were, um, articulated and elaborated.

00:57:44:20 - 00:58:15:06

So I say I think that's a matter for, uh, offline dialogue between us and the applicant, but we do. I think that that is going to be important because it's not, in our view, appropriate for, uh, the examination or the, uh, examining authority, uh, to seek to reach conclusions on a matter which does impact on national landscape, uh, without really a fully comprehensive understanding of what the implications are.

00:58:16:02 - 00:58:29:12

Uh, so that's the first point. Um, Then uh, the second uh point, um, which is related to that, uh,

00:58:31:01 - 00:58:48:27

we we think, uh, that in the context, uh, that there are going to be impacts on the national landscape by virtue of the arrays in whichever of the permutations, uh, they come forward.

00:58:50:12 - 00:59:29:08

And, uh, having regard to, uh, the policy advice and I'm thinking in particular of paragraph five, point 10.34 of N one, which is on the statutory duty, and it doesn't only bite on development, which actually takes place within a national landscape. Uh, the duty to seek to further enhance Has implications also for development, which might be outside of a national landscape, but which impacts upon it effectively the setting type position.

00:59:30:00 - 00:59:51:27

We think that there, uh, would need to be a very clear justification for an applicant to be able to say, well, look, here are two proposals within my project, one of which is more harmful to the national landscape than the other.

00:59:54:19 - 01:00:08:09

And I would like consent for both of them so that I can choose in due course which of those two I impose on the national landscape. Now, there may well be

01:00:09:24 - 01:00:24:07

a good enough justification to allow that choice to be maintained by the applicant, but in the context both of a general, uh, obligation to minimize harm,

01:00:26:01 - 01:00:54:04

but more particularly in the context of the national landscape, a statutory obligation to further the statutory purposes, at least so far as practicable. We think there would need to be a very strong justification to allow, as it were, that more harmful scenario to be kept in. If the outcome and aims of the project can be achieved with the less harmful scenario.

01:00:55:28 - 01:01:30:01

So I say we we think that that is an area, uh, which requires some further, uh, certainly justification from the applicant. I mean, we've seen what what has been said, particularly in the, um, uh, offshore description of the project, where effectively the rationale seems to be to maintain flexibility because technology changes may change over a period of time, but we're not really convinced that that's sufficient. Uh, where you've got, um, uh, a greater degree of harm being caused.

01:01:31:10 - 01:02:11:18

And I say it also relates back to my first point, because we we need to be really clear which of those two scenarios is that is actually the most harmful, particularly if the heights being reduced down to the 270 compared to, uh, the sorry, the two, the 370, I apologize compared to the 3 to 4m. So that's the second point. And then the third point is that, um, Suffolk County Council obviously has submitted its, uh, relevant, uh, representations which you've seen in which the applicant, uh, clearly has seen and commented on, uh, in its response.

01:02:12:05 - 01:02:21:14

Um, and that, uh, in relation to the national landscape has come to a view that the effects fall below the level of significant effects.

01:02:23:20 - 01:02:36:16

That we have now. Uh, being made aware differs from the assessment of Natural England as set out in their relevant representations.

01:02:38:05 - 01:03:08:06

We have reached our conclusion, in part by taking into account the advice of consultants, white consultants who have provided reports to the County Council, which we are intending. Uh, although they are in the public domain already, so I'm sure the applicant has seen them. But, um, so far as the Acsa is concerned, we're intending to append those to our local impact report so that they're in, uh, documents within this examination.

01:03:09:13 - 01:03:11:02

Um, and.

01:03:13:02 - 01:03:28:06

So we are not clear to what extent, uh, the Natural England conclusions take into account the assessment work that the County Council has carried out.

01:03:30:17 - 01:03:33:04

And we're not at the moment,

01:03:34:23 - 01:04:05:14

uh, fully clear as to why there is a difference between the, uh, the two assessments. But we do think it's important that we get a better understanding of that position. Um, so that if the position of the county council remains different to the position of Natural England, we can articulate to you in a sense why that is, or indeed, if the position of the county council were to change that, we can articulate to you why that is.

01:04:05:16 - 01:04:41:08

But that's something we're intending to look at. Now. We know what Natural England think. Um, we will attempt to have dialogue with Natural England about that, but we're conscious from what they've already said, that there are difficulties in terms of their, um, ability to engage with parties because of their other, um, uh, work streams. Um, so that's a matter that we need to, um, further if we can. And what we're intending to do is to have reached our own concluded position, certainly by the time that we're submitting the local impact report to you on the 22nd of October.

01:04:42:12 - 01:04:44:29

So those were my three points.

01:04:45:26 - 01:04:54:16

Thank you very much, Mr. Bedford. Is there anyone else in the room who wishes to speak on this matter? Yes, it's fairly far. Yes. Thank you. You can, if you wish. Yeah.

01:04:58:26 - 01:05:40:11

Um, main concerns are with the landscaping around the substation itself. Um, I think one of the points that we've possibly raised in earlier conversations And with the applicant was what alternatives have been considered? Um, in terms of just tree planting around the substation and in proximity to Norman's farmhouse? Um, the trees come very close to the to the rear of the yard. And it's what alternatives have been considered that maybe whether that's the only option or if something like a bund was um, an option, that obviously would also be more immediate because trees take a long time to grow, and there's a family that live in that house who have got to still look at it for all that time.

01:05:40:13 - 01:06:03:08

And it takes, it takes to grow. Um, so that yes, that's one of our main concerns and also the impact then of those trees on the remaining arable land that will be given back, tree roots, land drains. Could those things be mitigated if it was a park bund, potentially with trees on top, or how, you know, what the alternatives could be I think is are

01:06:04:23 - 01:06:05:10

are issue.

01:06:08:17 - 01:06:09:02

Okay.

01:06:10:18 - 01:06:13:08

Thanks very much. Um, is there anyone else in the room?

01:06:15:20 - 01:06:23:13

Is there anyone online who wishes to speak on this matter? Um, yes, I've got b c sorry I cannot. Oh.

01:06:26:14 - 01:06:30:21

Thank you. Go ahead. It's Ron Curtis for Baber district council. Thanks, madam.

01:06:31:09 - 01:06:32:18

Um, just to be very.

01:06:32:20 - 01:06:34:09

Brief and, uh, not to.

01:06:34:11 - 01:06:35:18

Repeat what colleagues from.

01:06:35:20 - 01:06:36:12

Other authorities have.

01:06:36:14 - 01:06:37:06

Already said, but.

01:06:37:12 - 01:07:18:08

We have made a submission under relevant reps. App nine, which sets out the concerns of baby District Council. We will be expanding on those in the ER, but just to make, um, a couple of headline points and again, repeat what county council colleagues have said about inviting, um, dialogue with the applicant. The concerns we have relate to the lack of information that's been provided so far to demonstrate, um, adequacy of Cumulative effects assessment and also visualizations in AP, AP 084 and AP 180 to 196.

01:07:18:22 - 01:07:27:25

Um, we will also be pointing out concerns relating to the lack of response on enhancements and compensation for landscape. Thank you.

01:07:34:00 - 01:07:39:11

Thank you very much. Uh, anyone else online who wishes to speak?

01:07:41:26 - 01:07:50:08

No. Um, in that case, if I could hand back to the applicant, I don't know whether there's any point you want to come back on at this moment on those.

01:08:32:27 - 01:08:35:01

Julian. Julian was all for the applicant.

01:08:36:21 - 01:08:56:22

I think our our approach is to want to sort of continue with the engagement that we've already got, rather than to reply to any specific points that have been raised, though that isn't any kind of endorsement of everything that's been said. The absence of comment shouldn't be interpreted in that way.

01:08:57:15 - 01:08:58:02

Thank you.

01:08:59:27 - 01:09:07:18

Can I just ask as a general point for both the applicant then and the local authorities in particular are on, for that matter, the um

01:09:09:12 - 01:09:23:07

AOB partnership. How is the engagement currently going? Are there any meetings scheduled? Our meetings likely to be scheduled after this hearing to address some of the issues that have been raised today?

01:09:26:08 - 01:09:35:19

Daniel writes for the applicant. Uh, meetings will be arranged. Um, we've already had initial discussions with Suffolk County Council. Um previously met with.

01:09:35:21 - 01:09:36:15

Both them on the national.

01:09:36:17 - 01:09:41:09

Landscape post application to discuss their relevant representations.

01:09:41:26 - 01:09:47:09

Um, I would be very happy to arrange a follow up meeting with the national landscape as well. Am.

01:09:49:25 - 01:09:55:05

I able to put any sort of timescale on that and or can the authorities help with any timescale?

01:09:56:28 - 01:10:20:00

That's not just county council. Um, engagement with the the applicants and their agents has been um, continuous throughout the lead up to the hearings and will continue going forward. Um, we have regular catchup meetings in our diaries. If there is, um, the wish to set up specific landscape sessions, then we will make additional time available in diaries to be able to do that.

01:10:24:07 - 01:10:51:13

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So we certainly would welcome, um, some dialogue to sort out some meeting dates soon because, as I say, we were hoping to be in a position to inform you of, ah, as it were settled position by the time of the local impact report, 22nd of October. Uh, so within the next week or so would be the ideal time to get that sorted and get that underway. And the sooner the better.

01:10:53:10 - 01:11:24:06

Certainly for both Essex and, well, the local authorities liaise to be informative. It does sound. This is a topic that does need to be picked up and dealt with sooner rather than later. It might, and I'm only suggesting, but there might even be scope for a multi-party type approach if that helps. Getting something into the calendar subject to availability, of course, with the relevant members of both the applicant team and several local authorities. But that might be something that pushes things on.

01:11:26:29 - 01:11:33:10

A certain logistics council that seems the most efficient use of everybody's time. So we'll look at that going forward. Thank you.

01:11:38:29 - 01:11:40:03

And Barbara.

01:11:43:05 - 01:12:09:10

Thank you, sir Brian Curtis, Faber District Council. Um, just wanting to make the point that maybe district council have not been substantively engaged by the applicant on this, um, project up to this date on this matter, but would welcome that and would prefer to do that collectively with the other local authorities and the national landscapes team, as we have used that sort of model of collaborative working on other projects, which has worked well. Thank you.

01:12:12:09 - 01:12:33:17

Thank you. I mean, it's sounding like collaborative working is perhaps the way forward, and it doesn't seem to be any objection to it. So no doubt, um, the parties, including the applicant will do their best to facilitate it, particularly picking up on the point that Mr. Bedford has made that nurses are not all that far away in terms of their expected submission.

01:12:37:07 - 01:12:52:16

Sorry if I may. Um, you're correct. And also your request to get statements of common ground across the line midway through the hearing was also relevant to this particular case. Um, whether whether it's it's an agreed or as a part is something is working.

01:12:52:18 - 01:12:58:24

I didn't want to, if you like rub the point about stating the common ground. But yeah, it's a natural candidate for inclusion.

01:13:14:25 - 01:13:44:18

And I think a lot of the questions I had sort of around the substation and air and gas installation and things have been covered in your summary. So that's really helpful. Thank you. Um, just a few remaining questions that I've got then. Um, you discussed about sort of, um, your reliance on natural grid and what's coming forward with those. Do you know if they've got an outline design for their substation? Yeah, as part of their consultation process. And if possible, would we be able to have details of it submitted?

01:13:52:06 - 01:14:05:12

To Phillips on behalf of the applicant. We currently do not have that information, which is why within our visualisations, we depict our Rochdale envelope, um, as a worst case scenario. Thank you.

01:14:07:05 - 01:14:13:21

At this stage, do you know whether National Grid are likely to go down the cold route or the gas cold route?

01:14:19:26 - 01:14:21:06

No, sorry. We don't.

01:14:27:09 - 01:14:52:01

Um, turning to the representations from Natural England, I don't think there's much I can ask, um, just at this point, because it sounds like the discussions are ongoing. Um, with them, I just noted that they referred to the, um, users of the King Charles the Third England Coast Path, um, during construction. And I wondered whether any survey work had been done in relation to the actual levels of usage along that footpath.

01:15:07:28 - 01:15:17:28

Simon Martin, on behalf of the applicant, can we just clarify that in respect of onshore impacts of the substation or offshore impacts in relation to the Euro Area Commission?

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

But.

01:15:36:07 - 01:15:48:17

Excuse me, Madam Paul Mackenzie for the applicant. Um, we, we have our, our landscape architects with us, not our sort of traffic and transport assessment people. We could possibly answer that in the traffic and transport station more easily. Yeah.

01:15:48:19 - 01:15:50:06

Okay. Sure. Thank you.

01:15:56:01 - 01:16:10:29

Um, and turning to the, um, turbine heights, obviously, we've discussed about the, um, options for large and small turbines. Would there be any situation where you might consider a combination, or is it going to be just large or just small turbines?

01:16:12:01 - 01:16:25:29

Uh, and it's mainly for the applicant. Uh, no. We will have the high likelihood that we will have one type of turbine at the site, as do every other wind farm I can think of. Thanks.

01:16:27:13 - 01:16:42:20

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, and, um, listening to the comments from Miss Fairlie about sort of the options around Norman's farmers, I think you want to sort of say about alternatives at this point, or is that something you wish to consider

01:16:44:10 - 01:16:45:05

another time?

01:16:48:23 - 01:16:55:00

And it's mainly for the applicant. I think these are some things that we'd like to discuss in a separate forum. Yeah.

01:16:57:18 - 01:16:58:27

Okay. Thank you very much.

01:16:59:09 - 01:16:59:28

Sorry, I just.

01:17:00:00 - 01:17:31:02

Have an additional point on that. And the first point is that the landscape planting, the mitigation planting we're showing is indicative. And we've created a framework. And there's another stage in that process where we would be detailing the design a lot more, um, detail. Um, the other point around bonding is, um, that the height that we're, we're getting out the planting by 15 years is 6 to 8m. And with bonding where we have used it, we take up to about one meter, maybe 1.5.

01:17:31:07 - 01:18:00:12

Um, quite often the feedback we get through consultation, as it can look quite alien within our sort of farmed landscape, especially if we were to build that up to higher, say, 4 or 5m in itself, it could become a bit of an obtrusive feature. Plus you've got problems of them drying out, especially where we've got increasing issues of drought over summer months. So it's something that's possible, but it's something we would probably try and avoid if we can rely on planting as it provides more reliable and effective screen. Thank you.

01:18:11:17 - 01:18:18:06

Okay. Um, that was all very helpful. So thank you to everyone who contributed. Is there any. Oh.

01:18:20:20 - 01:18:25:13

I would like to go back to the the issue of turbines. Um,

01:18:27:12 - 01:18:59:04

having said earlier, um, we're discouraged from doing maths. I've done some very rough maths. Um, can you assist in terms of the turbines? It would appear that if you go down the route of 41 turbines, then the output is going to be something. If you use around one gigawatt as the generating capacity,

you might be in the territory of turbines, um, that each would have an output of 26MW, something like that.

01:18:59:09 - 01:19:09:22

And if you don't go down the route of 79 smaller ones, you're around 13, 14MW. In very rough terms. Do those numbers sound about right? Firstly.

01:19:11:08 - 01:19:13:18

Uh, I mean, not for the applicant. Yes. Yeah.

01:19:14:06 - 01:19:39:14

And in terms of decision making about whether you go the larger route or the smaller route, what is going to determine that? Is it is it what's available in terms of the marketplace at that time? I mean, are there turbines out there at the moment that could generate at around 26 megawatt, or is that something that in design or being contemplated by the manufacturers?

01:19:40:09 - 01:20:05:05

Uh, Alex Menard for the applicant? Um, Yet there has been historically a continued accelerated growth in turbine sizes. This is why in consent envelopes, we need a larger one. Um, turbines. People are looking to design larger turbines, hence why we need to do it. Our final choice of turbines is largely market driven. What is available at the time? Um, it's a very competitive market and there's not that many suppliers.

01:20:12:01 - 01:20:25:22

And currently, in terms of schemes that have either just been commissioned or are perhaps being constructed at the moment. Can you give a feel for what sort of, um, output their turbines are with, or have.

01:20:26:16 - 01:20:37:07

The without prejudicing the other wind farms? Um, 15, 21MW?

01:20:51:24 - 01:20:53:09

Sorry. That was 15 to 21.

01:21:05:22 - 01:21:06:07

Thank you.

01:21:08:01 - 01:21:11:02

We've got Mr. Amster. It's got his hand up on screen.

01:21:12:18 - 01:21:44:21

Thank you, Simon Amstell, for representing the Suffolk and Essex coast. News, national landscape, the brand for the OMB. And just to take you back a couple of moments to the reference to the King Charles the Third um England Coast Path. While the national landscape isn't the responsible authority for developing proposals for the England Coast Path that relies or remains with Natural England and requires a secretary of state sign off.

01:21:45:09 - 01:22:22:07

Um, as I understand, the the route of the England Coast Path is not yet fully agreed. Along the Suffolk coast. Um, and, you know, we are anticipating that at some, some time. But there is something that the national landscape promotes is, is what's called the Suffolk Coast Path that was formed before the AUM be extended into Essex. Um, and that will, you know, is certainly a well-used path, a route from Lowestoft to, to, uh, Felixstowe.

01:22:22:25 - 01:22:29:27

Um, and that will be I would say that is a receptor for the offshore element. Thank you.

01:22:37:23 - 01:22:38:12

Thank you.

01:22:42:21 - 01:22:46:26

Um, is there anything else anyone would like to raise? Yes. It's fairly.

01:22:50:12 - 01:23:22:09

We're happy to continue the discussion as, um, I think Maynard said with our land agent present as well. But I think we just want to raise the point that if you drive around Tendring and on our farm in particular, there's four reservoirs, all of which have got which effectively looks the same as what a band would look. And they're all five, six, seven, potentially 14m in height in some places. And we would probably think that that would look more appropriate in that location, perhaps with some mature trees on the top.

01:23:22:11 - 01:23:31:28

I appreciate, but that wouldn't look out of place in the area and would be more effective for both visual impact and sound impact as well.

01:23:35:01 - 01:23:49:06

Thank you. Um, so that's perhaps probably something we can leave with the applicant's team to explore. And are there any further comments? No hands on line. Did the applicant want to come back on any further points at this stage?

01:23:53:23 - 01:23:58:29

No shaking hands. Um, I've got no further questions at this point. Any

01:24:00:19 - 01:24:12:00

further? Should we break now? Perhaps for Swat teams? Yeah. Um, is everyone happy to take a short break? Um, now, before we move on to the next agenda item,

01:24:13:19 - 01:24:16:26

do we think 15, 20 minutes?

01:24:19:12 - 01:24:26:29

Yeah, if we break, um, now it's just 3:10, and we'll come back at 25 past, if that's okay. Thank you very much.