



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm
Hearing:	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) – Part 1
Date:	31 October 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.

Simon Says

Transcript Export

<https://www.simonsaysai.com>

My New Project

Created on: 2024-10-31 11:31:55

Project Length: 01:19:32

Account Holder: Ryan Ross

File Name: Five Estuaries_CAH2_31OCT_PT1.mp3

File Length: 01:19:32

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:12:15 - 00:00:35:10

Well good morning everybody. It is now 10:00 am. So this hearing compulsory acquisition hearing two is now commencing. Can I confirm that? Firstly, everybody in the room can hear me. Yep. General indications. Yes. Um, can I also check with anybody that's attending online whether they can hear and see us?

00:00:37:11 - 00:00:41:12

Perhaps, Mr. Fenn, I can see your online. Can you indicate whether you can hear and see?

00:00:42:07 - 00:00:44:21

Yes, I can hear you. Thank you very much. Thank you.

00:00:49:05 - 00:00:54:08

And can I check with the case team that the live streaming and recording of both commenced?

00:00:54:21 - 00:00:58:09

I can confirm that the recording of the live stream has commenced.

00:00:58:21 - 00:01:31:21

Thank you. I'd like therefore to welcome everybody to compulsory acquisition hearing two concerning the applicant's proposals for compulsory acquisition and temporary possession of land in respect of the application for development consent for the proposed five estuaries offshore wind farm. My name is Graham Gould. I'm a charter town planner and an examining inspector with the Planning Inspectorate. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead panel member comprising the examining authority. I'm now going to ask my colleagues to introduce themselves.

00:01:33:27 - 00:01:41:09

Good morning. My name is Rebecca Norman. I'm a chartered town planner and examining inspector, and I've been appointed as a panel member of the examining Authority.

00:01:42:23 - 00:01:52:09

Good morning. My name is Felicity Weber. I am a chartered town planner and an examining inspector. I have been appointed as a panel member of the Examining Authority.

00:01:53:26 - 00:02:04:25

Good morning. My name is Mark Harrison. I'm also a chartered town planner and an examining inspector. I have been appointed as a panel member of the Examining Authority.

00:02:06:26 - 00:02:39:26

Good morning. My name is Matthew Heron. I am a charter town planner and an examining inspector, and I have been appointed to the panel as a panel member of this examining authority. So our role is to examine the application and to report to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and net zero, with a recommendation as to whether or not the development consent order should be made. At this point, I'd also like to introduce the members of the Planning Inspector, its case team who are supporting us today. We have K.J. Johansson, case manager for the project, and Deborah Allen and other colleague from the Planning Inspectorate to our left.

00:02:42:01 - 00:03:18:02

In addition, technicians from the audiovisual company KVS international contracted by the applicant, are in attendance solely for the purpose of managing the recording and live stream for this hearing. I'll now cover some brief housekeeping matters. Can everyone one? Please? Set all devices and phones to silent. The toilets are located beyond the doors at the back of the room, close to the registration desk. In the event of a fire alarm, please leave the room and use the marked fire exits at either end of the building or the building central staircase. Then make your way to Assembly Point A in the main car park, which is on the left hand side of the parking area.

00:03:18:09 - 00:03:23:20

You should then wait at the assembly point until stadium staff advise that it is safe to re-enter this hearing room.

00:03:25:05 - 00:03:56:10

So today's hearing is being undertaken both in person and with some online participation via Microsoft teams. We will make sure that if you are attending online today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate. The hearing is being both live streamed and recorded for those people participating or observing via Microsoft Teams in order to minimise background noise and disturbance. Can you please ensure that you stay on mute unless you are speaking? If you are participating online and wish to speak at the relevant point in the proceedings.

00:03:56:12 - 00:04:03:09

Please use the raise hand function. Please be patient as we may not get to you immediately, but we will invite you to speak at the appropriate time.

00:04:04:27 - 00:04:09:27

I would also remind everyone that the chat function on Microsoft Teams has been disabled for this event.

00:04:11:29 - 00:04:37:17

A recording of today's hearing will be available on the five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm project page of the planning Inspectorate's National Infrastructure website, as soon as practicable after the hearings. Conclusion. And with this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone stating your name and who you are representing each time before you begin speaking. If you are not at a table with a microphone, there is a roving microphone. So please wait for one of these to be brought to you before speaking.

00:04:39:03 - 00:05:15:14

If anyone wishes to use social media, report, film or record during today's hearing or any subsequent hearing, then you are free to do so. But please do so responsibly and with proper consideration. For other parties. This must not be disrupted, disruptive and material must not be misused. We aim to keep the hearing focused so that it can be conducted efficiently. You will find information about the application on the Planning Inspector, its National Infrastructure Planning project page for this application. We strongly encourage you to continue to familiarize yourself with this website, because the examining authority is using it to communicate with you and to provide access to documents throughout the examination.

00:05:16:20 - 00:05:41:25

So it's now necessary for me to say a few words on the General Data Protection Regulation. Digital recordings are retained and published. They form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and that you will, and that you therefore consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording.

00:05:43:12 - 00:06:14:13

The examining authority will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public record. That is important and relevant to the determination of this application. It will only be in the rarest of circumstances that we might ask you to provide personal information of a type that most of us will prefer to keep private or confidential. Therefore, I would ask you that you try your best not to add information to the public record that you wish to keep private, or that is confidential. Please also bear in mind that only officially the only official record of the proceedings is the recording that is to be placed on the Inspectorate's web page.

00:06:15:00 - 00:06:19:17

So thank you. I'm now going to pass over to Mrs. Norman to cover some of the other introductory matters.

00:06:21:02 - 00:06:47:15

Thank you. I'm now going to ask those of you who are planning to speak at today's hearing to introduce yourselves. Could you please do so stating your name and who you represent, along with the agenda item or items you wish to speak on? If you're not representing an organisation, please confirm your name, summarise your interest in the application and confirm the agenda items. Um, can we start with the applicant and its advisors, please? Um, Mr. Boswell, if I pass over to you.

00:06:48:19 - 00:06:58:17

Julian Boswell, a solicitor and partner with Burgess Salmon for the applicant. And I'll ask the other members of my team, starting on my far left, to introduce themselves.

00:07:00:22 - 00:07:03:11

James Eaton, onshore consents manager for the applicant.

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

Alice Maynard, engineering manager for the applicant.

00:07:10:24 - 00:07:13:09

And solicitor Burgess Salmon for the applicant.

00:07:15:09 - 00:07:19:03

Good morning. Adam Kendall, land transaction manager for the applicant.

00:07:20:26 - 00:07:22:13

Good morning, Adam Canning.

00:07:22:15 - 00:07:23:12

Uh, Daniel McLaren.

00:07:23:14 - 00:07:24:01

The.

00:07:24:03 - 00:07:25:14

Applicant's land agent.

00:07:27:26 - 00:07:30:06

Morning. Harry Stubbs, on behalf of the applicant.

00:07:34:09 - 00:07:38:16

Thank you, Mr. Boswell. Have you got anyone online that you wish to introduce at this stage?

00:07:44:17 - 00:07:47:27

Julian, boss of the applicant. Not anyone that needs to be introduced.

00:07:48:10 - 00:07:54:11

Thank you. Um, so, um, turning to the room, I see Mr. Church. Good morning.

00:07:55:19 - 00:08:01:07

Hey. Good morning. Gwen church, on behalf of Brooks Linney and as land agent to various landowners along the route.

00:08:04:11 - 00:08:07:29

Um, anyone else in the room that is wishing to speak? Good morning.

00:08:08:23 - 00:08:13:09

Good morning. Tamsin Fairley for T Valley and Sons and TNR Family Farms.

00:08:14:22 - 00:08:16:14

Thank you. Anyone else?

00:08:23:28 - 00:08:33:29

Thank you. I don't think we've got anyone in the room from the council, so if I move online, um, I can see Mr. Fell's name. Good morning.

00:08:35:28 - 00:08:45:17

Good morning. Sorry, my camera doesn't seem to work in. Um. Louis fell, acting on behalf of Stratton Parker Farms Limited and Leona Lianna Enterprises.

00:08:46:24 - 00:08:52:12

Thank you. And again we can see initials. So I'll go through I've got v h.

00:08:56:08 - 00:09:02:12

Hi. Victoria Harrison on behalf of the applicant, but not the need to speak today. Thank you. Thank you.

00:09:05:26 - 00:09:11:01

Um, I've also got a c h. Sorry, we can't see names from here. Very well.

00:09:16:00 - 00:09:17:01

Hello. I think.

00:09:17:03 - 00:09:25:00

That's me. I'm Catherine Hibbert from Holmes and Hill, appearing on behalf of the executors of the estate of Mr. Charles Table.

00:09:26:06 - 00:09:30:24

Thank you very much. Um, I've got f k.

00:09:35:15 - 00:09:36:00

Hi.

00:09:36:02 - 00:09:41:01

I'm just a screen sharing on behalf. Oh, sorry. Okay. Is there anyone else.

00:09:41:03 - 00:09:44:00

Online who wishes to speak? Who put your hand up. That's probably easier.

00:09:49:19 - 00:09:50:04

Now.

00:09:51:24 - 00:09:59:27

Okay. Thank you. Um, as per the other sessions, is there someone amongst the applicants team that's able to keep a list of the action points, please? Thank you.

00:10:05:00 - 00:10:09:17

So, is there anyone else present who may wish to speak today that I haven't noted?

00:10:12:20 - 00:10:25:16

Nope. Okay. But if anyone else decides that they wish to speak during the course of the hearing, um, please raise your hand, either physically or online, and we will come to you, um, when appropriate. Thank you very much.

00:10:28:05 - 00:10:56:27

That brings us to agenda item two. Uh, purpose of the hearing. Uh, this hearing will generally follow the agenda as issued on the Five Estuaries Project page on the 22nd of October. Um, it would obviously be helpful if you have a copy of this in front of you. Um, but could I perhaps also ask the applicant team if, uh, if the agenda could be displayed on the screens in the room? Thank you.

00:10:58:23 - 00:11:46:08

Um, you will see the hearing guidance noted in that agenda document for expediency. I'm assuming that everyone has read this, and therefore I don't propose to spend time reading it out now, but I will

make some elaborating remarks. Um, as you probably aware by now, the examination of this in CIP application is primarily to be conducted in written form. Um, the purpose of today's hearing is for the examining authority to hear evidence concerning the compulsory acquisition Position and temporary possession powers sought by the applicant in connection with the proposed development.

00:11:46:16 - 00:12:32:15

The matters for discussion during the course of compulsory acquisition hearing to have been identified by the Examining Authority, based on its consideration of the application documentation. The written representations made by other interested parties, and the oral and written submissions up to and including examination deadline two. So when you are answering the examining authority's questions today, please ensure that you provide succinct answers where a question is deserving of a yes or no type answer, then please respond accordingly.

00:12:32:24 - 00:12:46:02

Um, followed by any amplification as necessary. So before we move on, um, are there any comments or questions anyone wishes to make under this agenda item?

00:12:48:22 - 00:13:15:24

Seeing anybody in the room with hands up and not seeing anything online. So thank you very much for that. So this concludes this item of the agenda. So turning now to the substance of today's hearing item three of the agenda beginning with item 3.1. Um, and this is being led by Mr. Gould.

00:13:23:02 - 00:13:43:26

Thank you for, um, this section, um, of the agenda. What I'm proposing is that each of the affected persons who wishes to give a summary of, of their position with respect to the applicants, um, proposals for both compulsory acquisition and temporary possession do so. Um

00:13:45:11 - 00:14:09:13

in particular in relation to the compulsory acquisition acquisition powers that are being sought. Um, I would like you, if possible, in giving your, uh, case summaries, uh, to indicate where you think, uh, the proposals that the applicant has put forward in terms of compulsory acquisition, do or do not accord, uh, with section 1 to 2 of the act,

00:14:11:06 - 00:14:54:09

and also where they, um, you consider, um, the compulsory acquisition proposals do or do not accord with the 2008 guidance that relates to procedures for compulsory acquisition of land. Um, I would also stress, just for those who may not be familiar with this type of hearing and for that matter, for the examination of a nationally significant infrastructure project. Um, it is not for the examining authority or for that matter, the Secretary of State, to consider any matters relating directly to compensation that might arise from compulsory acquisition of land.

00:14:55:09 - 00:15:11:26

Um, so if anybody at any stage during the course of the day, um, starts to touch on matters that relate directly to compensation, uh, we will ask you to stop giving such evidence because we cannot hear it and we cannot report on it.

00:15:17:14 - 00:16:03:13

I think what I would suggest is perhaps a running order is that we start with the executors, uh, for Mr. Table. Then we turn to Strutt and Parker and uh, Mr. Fell. Uh, then we'll turn to, um, Mr. Church and any evidence that he's giving up on behalf of his, uh, various clients, then to the, um. Now, I need to

be careful with the faith how we're going to describe, uh, in compulsory acquisition hearing one, we referred, um, to the fairly generally because you miss fairly you were representing t fairly and some others.

00:16:04:13 - 00:16:25:06

I can we refer to the the group that you're speaking as to fairly just for sure. And um, Mr. Fairlie, are you content that we refer to you representing Henry fairly? Yeah. We'll hopefully we won't get too messy, but, um, we'll just see how that all goes.

00:16:43:25 - 00:16:50:21

Um, so if we can start with the executors for, um, Mr. Tabor.

00:16:55:23 - 00:17:00:26

Thank you. Catherine Hibbert, on behalf of the executors of the estate of.

00:17:01:21 - 00:17:21:02

Just before you start, um, do you prefer to be titled Mrs.. Miss? Miss. Uh, Mrs.. Fine. Mrs.. Um. And are you speaking from a prepared note? I'm just wondering whether we're going to need to make lots of notes or whether we we don't need to make quite as many notes, and you'll be submitting something at the next deadline.

00:17:22:06 - 00:17:29:20

I'm I hope that you've all received the, uh, or seen at least the representation and summary.

00:17:29:24 - 00:17:30:17

Yes we have.

00:17:30:21 - 00:17:48:14

So I don't tend to or I don't intend to deviate too much from that. I should flag up that, um, my colleague Gwen Church is with you in the room, and he may wish to add. Uh, to to what I say, perhaps, um.

00:17:48:29 - 00:18:26:04

Just just before you start, can I just seek one point of clarification? Um, which is, I think paragraph 2.3 in rep to zero 80, which was your main submission? Um, there's a there's reference or there's a conversion of the substation site. Uh, plot 17 0025, which in round terms is about 18.2 hectares. In paragraph two three, that's referred to as 75 hectares, which I think might be a little bit out on the maths front.

00:18:26:23 - 00:18:35:18

Um, and I'm just wondering whether that math has then affected anything else that may have been stated in writing throughout the rest of the submission?

00:18:36:11 - 00:18:52:20

We can check that. I don't think there's any particular, uh, impact from that. It was really to just give the context of the, um, you know, the size of the the farm of which, um, the compulsory purchase proposals affect part.

00:18:54:01 - 00:19:02:04

Okay. Certainly. I'll, I'll check that checked. Yeah, yeah. So if you'd like to proceed. Thank you, Mrs. Hibbert.

00:19:03:11 - 00:19:33:13

Okay. So the estate, um, is the freehold owner of plots 1725. Um, and essentially, this has been included in the, uh, the DCO proposals in order to live, to deliver the substation and associated Substation compound works, which includes some temporary uses. Construction compounds and accesses, and some more permanent uses.

00:19:33:15 - 00:20:08:07

Drainage, um, landscaping, etc.. Only a very small portion of plot 1725 is actually required for the footings of the substation. And, uh, we do consider that, uh, it wouldn't take a lot of effort to actually relocate the footing of the substation for the five estuaries entirely onto adjoining land, which is also within the order limits. So avoiding any impact on our client's property.

00:20:09:13 - 00:20:11:21

Our point is that, um,

00:20:13:07 - 00:20:49:24

our client's land isn't required in, um, in part, potentially not required at all to deliver the substation and the associated works, and therefore doesn't meet the legal tests. In section 122 A the Planning Act, we further submit it's not required to deliver the associated works in whole law part the testing section one to 2BA lot of that land is required for landscaping and, uh, environmental mitigation.

00:20:49:26 - 00:21:16:07

And it's not really clear why such a large portion of land is required to deliver that. In particular, if it's required for BNG, there's no obligation to have that delivered on the site and it could be delivered elsewhere and therefore the, um, there's no compelling case in the public interest to acquire a whole or part of that land.

00:21:18:29 - 00:21:44:19

Further, um, it's not legitimate for the purposes of the Planning Act, to take into account considerations relating to the North Falls scheme. When considering whether to confirm, um, compulsory acquisition of this land for the Five Estuaries Scheme. Further detail is set out in the full written representations. And this is just a summary of of those.

00:22:03:10 - 00:22:09:16

First I've got the microphone. I suppose I would also like to point out that, um,

00:22:11:14 - 00:22:16:19

this plot of my client's land is grade one agricultural land.

00:22:18:27 - 00:22:24:18

And as such it would be preferable to avoid use of that land. And, um.

00:22:26:18 - 00:22:31:22

You know, cite relevant proposals on a, um, less valuable.

00:22:34:09 - 00:22:34:24

Um.

00:22:35:22 - 00:22:39:01

Land in terms of, uh, agricultural classification.

00:23:01:10 - 00:23:09:17

Thank you. Was there anything, Mr. Church, that you felt you needed to do added to what Mrs. Hibbert has just said on behalf of the executives.

00:23:10:19 - 00:23:13:15

At Gwen Church, on behalf of Brooks Lilley? Not at this moment. Thank you.

00:23:19:27 - 00:23:26:29

Turning, turning to the applicant. Do you want to make any sort of response to what's just been said at this point?

00:23:34:00 - 00:23:37:23

Oh, let me get you to applicant. Um, so we can put.

00:23:37:25 - 00:23:43:18

You closer to the mic. Um, I think that actually literally have to be brought. Um.

00:23:46:03 - 00:23:46:27

Is that better?

00:23:47:11 - 00:23:48:03

Yes, I think so.

00:23:48:05 - 00:24:05:03

Thank you. Um, Paula McAdoo for the applicant. Um, we consider we have already made written submissions on the points that have just been raised. And rather than take the time now to rehearse material that's already before you, we would suggest that we could put the references to that in our summary of the oral submissions of this hearing.

00:24:09:10 - 00:24:11:12

Yeah. Proceed on that basis.

00:24:30:21 - 00:24:40:26

So then moving on to, um, Strutt and Parker Farms and Mr. Fell. Um.

00:24:43:12 - 00:25:00:23

Mr.. All I would indicate in, um, making your case, if you can perhaps focus on points that you haven't necessarily covered in, uh, much detail previously, rather than repeating a lot of evidence that we've already heard from you and or seen in writing.

00:25:03:00 - 00:25:43:13

Thank you. I think, in which case, you know, um, we've been through, as you said, a lot of all the practical things about construction and the temporary possession rights, um, which I think from the other day, We we've made some good progress on my our main issue is about the potential impact on, um, part of the scheme, um, uh, which is, uh, potentially affecting a development site. And I believe that, uh, there was um, in, in, uh, preference would be was two things.

00:25:43:15 - 00:26:26:00

Our preference would be that the cable route would be located just to the north of the current route, which is within my client's ownership, and they're more than happy to accommodate that. Uh, accordingly. Um, if that um, the the alternative is to put the easement width, which is, um, 40m, um, to sorry. And that includes north full. So here it's probably 20m, as what we're talking about is our preference is that that is located to the north of the cable corridor, as far north as possible to enable us to avoid, uh, conflict.

00:26:26:09 - 00:26:58:15

Um, because there is an argument in our mind that the, you know, there is public good on what we're proposing to do and development wise. And so I think really, uh, that is our main position is that, uh, we would we would like to try and avoid as much conflict by, um, either locating slightly north or within northern strip of the cable easement route. Um, and obviously we're thinking about having to accommodate North Falls as well as five estuaries.

00:26:58:17 - 00:27:17:03

But I appreciate you've only got to, uh, deal with five estuaries. So that would be the 20 easement strips, the most northern bit, which will have an impact. But we can try and mitigate that with, um, you know, green space and other bits and bobs that we'll need to do as part of our proposed development.

00:27:24:25 - 00:27:32:09

But otherwise, I think all the other points in my relate are in my written submissions. You know, I mean, just rehearsing that, obviously.

00:27:39:21 - 00:28:06:03

Thank you. Mister. I'm just wondering so that everybody's clear in terms of, um, your client's preference for things to be as far north as possible, whether we need to perhaps get some of the land plans up now, um, so we can actually see precise the area of most significance in in that regard. Um, would that assist if we got the land, the relevant land plans up?

00:28:08:00 - 00:28:16:27

Uh, that would be. It's sheets. Uh, sheet seven of 20 on the land plans. Um, is the relevant plan? Uh.

00:28:19:18 - 00:28:22:11

And I asked the land plan be brought up.

00:28:27:03 - 00:28:30:07

So that's 8008.

00:28:55:26 - 00:28:57:11

As sheet seven, we need.

00:29:09:16 - 00:29:12:09

All right. That's different to the ones I'm looking at. Um.

00:29:17:19 - 00:29:22:12

Uh. That's it. Sheet seven. Yeah, I think it's page eight, but sheet seven.

00:29:34:17 - 00:29:39:27

Um, yeah. So that's the where we're talking about. So our preference is,

00:29:41:16 - 00:30:14:10

um, our clients only can see that all the land to the north of this, um, route between the two roads is my client's property. And our preference is to avoid the blue cable corridor of the line to the northern and eastern boundary is the extent of our proposed development. So it's already conflicting with both. So our preference would have been to go further north of that and directionally drill right underneath the two, um, water bodies.

00:30:15:12 - 00:30:40:08

Um, failing that, and I, you know, we've had some discussions over that, but, uh, I understand they have some issues with that which I've put in my written representations, but failing that, to have the easement corridor within the the sort of north eastern boundary of the Blue Line would, would greatly assist and prevent, um, you know, a direct conflict between the two proposed developments.

00:30:46:05 - 00:31:10:20

You know, I understand why the developer is seeking for such a wide cable corridor at this stage. But but like we discussed the other day about the same possession rights, if the ground conditions are suitable, uh, which, you know, we're pretty confident in the ground conditions across that whole cable corridor are very similar that there should be no reason why that cable corridor couldn't be located as far north as northern eastern boundary as possible.

00:31:15:28 - 00:31:28:21

In my experience of other developments, the often cable route taken is often a center line in this blue line and then easements either side. But you know, that's it. There's no reason why it couldn't be further north, if you see what I mean.

00:31:35:08 - 00:31:40:05

Thank you. Mr.. Phil, does the applicant want to make any comment, particularly on that last point?

00:31:42:16 - 00:31:45:13

Or do you want to wait and respond

00:31:46:29 - 00:31:51:03

in response to the written submission, which does pick up on these sorts of issues?

00:31:54:03 - 00:32:26:10

For the applicant? I'm not sure. There's terribly much we could see now to assist you. So we we did receive and did you consider the request to move the cable corridor further north? There were, um, good reasons, including engineering reasons why that is not an option we wish to pursue. We are happy to set that out of it as helpful. Possibly not in this heading. Probably better done in writing in terms of where we go within the cable corridor. We simply cannot commit to this at that stage. We, you know, we we are seeking the cable corridor. We are seeking because we need the flexibility to route within that.

00:32:26:12 - 00:32:33:21

So in terms of the final intake, yes, it will be less, but we cannot commit to where in that cable corridor it is. Precisely we will be at this stage.

00:33:30:27 - 00:33:38:04

Thank you, Mr. Feld. Was there anything else that you wish to say in opening or. Yes.

00:33:38:14 - 00:34:16:29

I mean, I would I would just like to respond to that because we were we had asked them to directly drill under the two, uh, water bodies there, and we were told that it was possible to go underneath the water body. Um, in all due respect, I've been on many of these schemes and so completely disagree with McGeady there because there's plenty of schemes that go under water bodies, whether they're rivers or whatever else. So I believe that we were fobbed off in, in, in by just being told that it wasn't possible because it's, you know, as I the general principle and all these schemes, the cable routes being set for a long period of time, and they do not like to deviate away from it.

00:34:17:17 - 00:34:50:09

Um, there it is possible to, to go around there. It's just, you know, some surveys would need to have been done and they just didn't want to incur that cost and weren't willing to engage. Secondly, in terms of where the cable route goes within that easement. Again, my my point is here we should be only being the public interest, being given the rights that are absolutely necessary. That is a wide cable corridor which also is wide enough to accommodate the North Falls. But it shouldn't be. And this whole process should only be about five Street rather than North Falls.

00:34:50:17 - 00:35:27:03

But, um, why should they have such wide ranging powers to come through on what is just standard agricultural land. If the developer at this stage is not able to tell you where they want to put the cable corridor for whatever reason, I can only assume that's because of, um, so the cable easement because of ground conditions, why have they not come out and done surveys in order to assess the ground conditions, to make sure they're suitable? Because the inference is, is that how do they know that even within that blue line is suitable if they cannot determine, determine where at this moment in time, in the blue line, the easement will go.

00:35:27:05 - 00:35:47:02

How do we even know at this point in time that it is possible to put it in that easement strip? I think it's it's a developer's way of trying to retain as much flexibility as possible without having any, uh, due respect to the landowners who are significantly affected by it. So in all due respect to Mr. McGeady, I completely disagree with that.

00:35:49:19 - 00:35:53:00

I find it disrespectful to the landowners who are affected by this.

00:36:36:17 - 00:36:51:22

Does the applicant want to respond to that point? I mean, I think might assist the examining authority to have a better understanding of what survey work, ground condition wise has or has not been done up to this point.

00:36:52:28 - 00:37:24:20

Parliament began. Um, with the greatest respect, sir, I disagree because that is not the point. What Mr. Fail is effectively seeking here is the level of detail that comes at the detailed design nor insight project. Using a linear project using a corridor approach would have that level of detail. At this stage, the survey work and the design work that is needed to see where we are going within this corridor will not be done pre consent, and it's not done for any inset pre consent because it's far too big a cost and a huge amount of work and an imposition on landowners to do all that work.

00:37:24:22 - 00:37:55:09

This is entirely normal approach or an DCO linear project. They all take a corridor. And in some of our written submissions we have given you examples of the corridors and the width of corridors on other projects, and we are happy to add to that list if it is helpful. Um, I don't think particularly running through every survey we have or haven't done is going to take us any further forward. Mrs. Maynard is, however, very happy to explain why we can't just HDD under the water bodies if that is of assistance. But again, we are happy to set that out in writing as well.

00:38:23:00 - 00:38:28:05

It's made in terms of horizontal drilling. Can you give a brief explanation?

00:38:31:23 - 00:39:05:20

Yes, Miss Maynard, for the applicant. So in terms there's two issues here that I've heard raised, one about going most northerly within the corridor. And the second issue is about drilling under the water bodies, which is essentially going north and drilling under water bodies. Um, I mean, Mr. Phil is correct in the aspect that you can drill under water bodies, but there are other constraints that are being considered here. So north of the cable corridor, there's an affinity water main that we have to cross that would be clashing with this.

00:39:05:22 - 00:39:36:19

So we can't just go north of the water and go north and go under his, because it's not possible with the constraints for that. When we cross that, uh, water main, obviously we tend to do with drilling under it and we tend to cross at the perpendicular as possible after we've crossed that water vein, then we've got a quite a tight bend going round, as you'll see in the corridor. This is constrained by the minimum bend radius of the ducks.

00:39:36:21 - 00:39:50:15

So we're coming around as sharp as possible so that we can get as north as possible. The cable route has been altered. Appear to aim to get as north as possible in the area indicated. Um,

00:39:52:05 - 00:39:55:21

which is why we are in this position as we are now.

00:40:28:23 - 00:40:34:16

Mr.. I see your hand. Is is that a new legacy hand or a new point? Uh.

00:40:35:06 - 00:41:07:24

I would just like to make the point here that there I understand that they're needing to cross over water main and and it's it's probably frustrating. shame we don't have a clue where that water main lies. So you can reference that to this plan. I think this needs to be considered afterwards, but I from my understanding where the water main comes, they could still cross over it without running parallel to it, but it might not be at right angles. But there's plenty of examples of of cable corridors going under water mains that aren't exactly at 90 degree right angles.

00:41:08:04 - 00:41:43:08

I think what Mr. Maynard have saying there that it's perfectly possible to go underneath the water body. The constraint here seems to be a water main. Now that you're then deciding as to whether, you know, have they done any investigative routes about whether they could temporarily divert that water main was there directory drill underneath it or various other matters? It's perfectly civil construction

wise, all possible to do that. And it seems to me that we that they're taking, you know, the least cost approach, which is causing maximum disruption and potential conflict for my client.

00:41:43:10 - 00:42:22:03

I don't think that is necessarily the right way forward, that that should have been considered in this approach, because I don't believe the additional cable length would have been significantly greater, as you can sort of see and gauge by this plan. The point is really at what point how do they cross over the water main. Um, so I'm I'm not a technical expert, but I'm sure in the next written representations, if we have the details exactly where the water main is, I will be able to get a third party consultant to provide the case that would support that, which seems to be the the only issue as to why we couldn't go underneath the, uh, further north out of this blue line, uh, cable corridor.

00:42:38:13 - 00:42:47:14

In the post hearing submissions that flow out of this camp. We perhaps have a plan that just shows where the water main is included.

00:42:50:28 - 00:42:52:26

Yes. Thank you.

00:43:01:21 - 00:43:10:19

Before we perhaps move on to another. But was there anything that the applicant wanted to say further in respect of the submissions that Mr. Fellows made on behalf of his client?

00:43:17:02 - 00:43:30:25

Uh, Paul McGuinness, without looking. Oh. Unsurprisingly. Sorry. We don't accept Mr. Phil's positions. We are happy that our site selection has been done appropriately, and we are entirely confident in standing behind it. I don't think there's anything we could say that would take us further forward from that.

00:43:30:28 - 00:43:31:13

Thank you.

00:43:49:24 - 00:44:00:10

So turning to Mr. Church and your various clients, are you going to make submissions on individual clients or is it a bit more generic?

00:44:01:11 - 00:44:05:15

Good morning Gwen church of Brooklyn. Uh, generic, a bit more generic, right?

00:44:09:14 - 00:44:41:27

I should say, um, thank you for submitting that note. Um, those of you who were present at issue specific hearing three on. Yes. Tuesday, uh, we requested from Mel via mr. church that Brooks Lane identify who their clients were and instructional details and which land plot. That note has been received. It will be published in due course, but we haven't had yet the time or had the opportunity yet to give the necessary instructions.

00:44:41:29 - 00:44:59:16

But we certainly have that information. Um, so, Mr. Church, your submission, in effect, will be across the board for all of those parties, including Mr.. Table or a leaving that that side of things to one side because of what we said earlier.

00:45:01:00 - 00:45:10:12

Gwen church, on behalf of Selena, it will very much be generic, including, um, some punch and substation, which affects both TI fairly and the executives of Charles Tabor.

00:45:28:28 - 00:45:29:19

Proceed. Thank you.

00:45:29:22 - 00:45:31:09

Okay. Thank you. Um,

00:45:32:24 - 00:45:42:06

obviously, without wishing to repeat too much with Mr.. Too many of Mr.. Fell's points, as well as what was raised on the issue specific hearing on number three on Tuesday.

00:45:43:27 - 00:46:16:25

We have been engaging with the applicant for approximately three years. Um, as time has gone on, there has been some additional information provided. And at this stage where we're at today and appreciate we're here for five stories, but we understand at five stories, being the applicant and North Falls are collaborating on their design and approach. From a landowner's perspective, we're struggling to see this at this moment in time. Uh, reasons being in relation to a substation sites for very differing designs on landscape and ecology mitigation.

00:46:18:02 - 00:46:50:27

Accordingly, there's different areas of potential land take causing clients obviously um, uncertainty and concerns. And that includes matters such as bonding and landscape design itself. We've also been told that if one scheme, for example, the applicants does not proceed, whereas North Wales does then actually land take at the substation sites will will much be the same and there won't be a drastic change in what land is exercised and acquired compulsorily.

00:46:51:28 - 00:47:22:24

Which begs the question whether the land being acquired is, uh, required to facilitate or, um, incidental to the scheme itself. Under section two, 1 to 2 of a compulsory um Planning Act 2008. We're also concerned about the width that the cable corridor provides. At the moment, we're talking a 100 metre corridor to facilitate both the applicant scheme as well as North Hall's. Um, there's a huge amount of flexibility in that for the applicant.

00:47:22:26 - 00:48:00:21

But there's also a huge concern that if he schemes do both proceed, that we could be left with a 20 metre, sorry, a 60 metre A sterile strip in between the applicants cable and no false cable, rendering that strip of land sterile in perpetuity. Um, we again believe that the effects here are in excess of what's required by the applicant, and the long term implications on the land owners are detrimental. We touched on the haul road on Tuesday and the issue specific hearing three, but again lack of collaboration between the projects.

00:48:01:00 - 00:48:17:02

Um, with the applicant having a differing Hall Road proposal to North Falls again causing excitement, again creating additional temporary land take in excess of what we believe is necessary and necessary for the delivering of a scheme.

00:48:20:15 - 00:48:52:08

We've also asked the applicant three weeks ago to issue a plan for the substation site, detailing what the scheme would look like should only the applicant scheme proceed? Were yet to receive that plan, because at this moment in time, we are concerned that we're looking at a circus 75 acre land take at Little Bromley, which we believe incredibly excessive, especially if only one scheme goes ahead. And that doesn't include the lands under the executors of Charles Taylor's ownership.

00:48:52:26 - 00:48:53:11

And.

00:48:55:23 - 00:49:07:00

Ultimately, we're concerned about the excess of land take, both temporarily and compulsorily, and the lack of collaboration between both the applicant and North Falls and.

00:49:10:15 - 00:49:32:09

I think most of these points are covered in my previous submissions, but, um, I hope I've summarized those well enough for you. And without wanting to, as I say, repeat too many of Mr. Fell's points. But we I do. Second, Mr. Fell's comment on the wide range of flexibility the applicant is seeking. Um, which seems to be, um, unnecessary. Thank you.

00:49:46:29 - 00:50:30:09

Thank you, Mr. Phil. Um, does the applicant want to respond? I think we would particularly like some assistance with understanding how, um, easements, um, might end up being, um, put in place. The Mr. church indicate what raised a concern that potentially, given the width of the cable corridor, there's a there's a potential for for the, um, the ducting or the cabling for five estuaries, in effect, to become quite divorced from, um, whatever north of North Falls might do, and that there might be a sterile area between.

00:50:30:29 - 00:50:44:19

Are you able to give any sort of indication at this stage as to whether or not the two projects are likely to try and align? So that they they didn't end up with a significant gap between the two cable runs.

00:50:47:20 - 00:51:11:15

Uh, well, I'm a good applicant and shorts are. No. We have responded to this in our responses to written questions, but the fundamental point that we would like to make here is that we don't accept a sterilization as an appropriate description for what is happening here. This is agricultural land which would be returned to agricultural use. It is not sterilized from that use. But we have made a much more detailed submission on that in our written submissions.

00:52:05:12 - 00:52:20:03

It's the church. Have you had the opportunity to look at what the applicant responded to at deadline two, in particular, in response to the written question that we issued? And do you have any view on particularly on the sterilization point and the response to the applicant has given to it?

00:52:21:17 - 00:52:57:06

Thank you. Gwen Church, on behalf of Brooklyn. This is a matter which has been discussed, um, for approximately three years, and whilst we appreciate the land in between, the two projects will not be sterilised from agricultural use. Nor is the land directly above the cables is not sterilized in agricultural use, but it's the long term short to long term opportunities for the landowners to, um, look

at other opportunities on their on their holdings, whether that's planting woodland, agroforestry, solar extending farm yards, etc.

00:52:57:14 - 00:53:29:17

naturally, with a strip up to 60m between an applicant's project and the North Wales project, it renders that land sterile from future opportunities. And that's what we're here to do, is to protect our clients long term opportunities on their holding. Now, granted, any land directly above the cables will be sterile and that's accepted. But if those cables were aligned and the projects were collaborating between them, which, as I said earlier, from a Landon's perspective, clearly isn't happening or it doesn't feel like it's happening.

00:53:30:06 - 00:53:46:20

It's limiting the adverse impact these schemes will have on the clients holding. So we we have been requesting and we continue to request that in some way or another, these projects must be collaborating to mitigate the long term impact on our clients retain property.

00:53:49:02 - 00:53:49:17

Thank you.

00:54:18:15 - 00:54:59:00

I'll just sorry to add to that. An example of that would be in relation to my client, Adam Brown, who would be on sheet approximately sheet five of 17 on the land plans where the cable corridor abuts existing farmyard, meaning that he, going forward, possibly may never be able to expand his farmyard. Um, as you can, you can appreciate it's very concerning to the future viability of the business. Again, we've requested for the cables in that situation to be aligned to the south, uh, to the subject to the eastern boundary of a corridor, thereby allowing him to extend his farmyard should the need to have a rise in the future.

00:54:59:04 - 00:55:13:04

As it stands at the moment, we could have one cable with the applicant's cable adjoining his farmyard and northwards to the other end of the corridor, renting out 60m in between, sterile from, uh, future cultural buildings.

00:56:08:08 - 00:56:23:17

So I'm just looking at a sheet. I think, could I ask for sheet five in the land plan to be brought up on screen and perhaps if Mr. Church could try and locate precisely the the farmyard that he's referring to.

00:56:24:15 - 00:56:31:05

You're very happy to do so. I'm just trying to. I'm pretty sure it's sheep. Five. I've been sheep for from McLaren. Thank you.

00:56:45:11 - 00:56:50:16

So yeah, that's sheep for that, sir. Are you able to. That's correct.

00:56:50:18 - 00:57:22:12

Thank you. Yeah. Um, that and I appreciate those engineering factors to be, um, uh, factored in here, but that corridor width where it you should have a 90 degree bend. It immediately abuts my client's farmyard and existing buildings. Now, we've requested initially to have a corridor moved approximately 40, 15m away from the yard to allow a future expansion. That hasn't happened. And

again, I reiterate, I appreciate those engineering factors. And I'm not an engineer, so I can't comment too much on that.

00:57:22:14 - 00:57:39:21

But at the very least, we would need some sort of commitment to locate those cables to the east of that blue corridor, thereby allowing my client to expand his farm yards. Whether it's during this generation or future generations, um, freely and having unfettered land adjoining his farm yard.

00:57:41:17 - 00:57:48:08

To date, I haven't received anything in writing to that extent or seen any amendments to the plans. Thank you.

00:58:36:20 - 00:58:42:03

Did the applicant want to make any comment response to particular that point that Mr. Church has raised or.

00:58:44:28 - 00:59:20:00

Agreed with applicant? Um, so we are we're finding it a little bit inconsistent on the North Pole's point. I want firstly to make the point that we are seeking consent for our development as set out in schedule one of the DCO, which does include a second set of docs. Those second set of docs were included in collaboration with North Poles. Um, in order to first of all, define a sort of common cable corridor and to promote collaboration and where possible, reduce impacts. That is collaboration. We are now being criticized that we are not collaborating, but both of those things cannot be true.

00:59:20:13 - 00:59:43:02

Um, in terms of the particular land plot that we were being directed to as Mister Church did, note, there are engineering and technical constraints there, and we are happy to provide an explanation of that in writing if it's all resistant. But fundamentally, we cannot and will not at this time give a commitment to either move the corridor or locate within a particular point in that corridor, because we cannot do so.

01:00:46:27 - 01:01:37:20

I think going forward. I mean, Mr. Church this morning has raised, um, a particular concern with a particular location for one of his clients. Um, and that's possibly a potential difficulty with making generic submissions. I think it would be useful. Mr. church, post this hearing. Uh, and therefore, in effect, as an action arising out of this hearing, if you could identify in, in a written note any particular locations on behalf of your various clients, where you think there may be issues that are impacting upon farming operations, uh, so that at least the examining authority has a better understanding of where they may be, um, for want of a better way, describing pinch points.

01:01:38:12 - 01:02:09:17

Um, we then potentially I think this is a matter we're going to come on to later. Uh, the close of this hearing, but with we're starting to think about where we may need to visit, um, either as an, a fully accompanied basis or perhaps on an access required basis, but at least we will get a better understanding of some of these matters. Actually seeing them literally in the field, um, rather than on plan and hearing oral, but up to this point. And similarly, Mr.

01:02:09:19 - 01:02:44:19

Fellow, I think we've we've got an understanding of some of the points that you've raised in that regard. I think it would be of assistance to the examining authority. Uh, not least, as I say, we need to

think about how we're going to sort out, um, future inspections as part of this examination. Um, if we could have some clarity on precise as a, not not a perfectly good phrase, but pinch points or areas that are of particular concern from a farming perspective, um, that we can view when we're actually out on site.

01:02:47:24 - 01:02:51:20

Stretches. That's something that you'll be able to do. Following this hearing.

01:02:53:05 - 01:02:56:13

You, Gwen church, on behalf of Selena. That's absolutely fine. Thank you.

01:03:01:00 - 01:03:14:23

We'll we'll come back to action points at the end. And we can bring Mr. fell into that discussion and potentially some of the other parties who are going to give their submissions in later on in this hearing.

01:03:16:18 - 01:03:27:07

I think we've probably taken, um, the case that Mr. Church wants to make as far as we can this morning. Was there anything else that you wish to raise at this point?

01:03:28:03 - 01:03:29:09

Uh, no. That's it. Thank you very much.

01:03:29:11 - 01:03:29:26

Thank you.

01:03:35:04 - 01:03:47:03

Turning then to T Fairlie, was there anything, Miss Fairlie, that you wanted to add? Uh, on behalf of family members in your case that you're representing. Yes.

01:03:47:16 - 01:04:30:15

Just for clarity, it is Mrs. Fairlie, not Mrs. Curry. Okay. I'm not offended. Um, I don't want to duplicate anything that Gwen has particularly said, but just in the interest of clarity, and we did obviously write these in our written representation. Um, but our main points relate to the land plot, which is 17 024, and it's the volume of land taken. The difference comes back to differences between the two schemes, but in our view, the section of land that's been included that creates a um encloses the yard and introduces tree planting around the entirety of the field isn't necessary.

01:04:30:17 - 01:04:36:29

So we're requesting that plot to be removed. Well, that part of that plot, I should say.

01:04:46:18 - 01:05:17:07

And we do have some concerns still about the the lack of clarity around what land is environmental mitigation versus B, and I appreciate that. There's always some double counting. On one hand, we're being told they're there isn't being. And that if we have to provide being, we'll need to take additional land. But obviously that raises some concerns because where does that going to go? Um, so I think we need we just need to have some certainty on that to, to understand exactly where we are. Um,

01:05:19:02 - 01:05:36:29

we've also mentioned about the, the split of the whole road on the south side of Ardley Road opposite Norman's farm. And our view is that plots 17, 004 and 005 aren't necessary.

01:06:01:18 - 01:06:02:24

Thank you, Mrs. Fairlie.

01:06:07:02 - 01:06:38:09

Did the applicant want to say anything in response to what Mrs.. Mrs. Fairly has just said, or are you going to rely mainly on a written sponsor? Further to their written submission, I do have a question about the interrelationship between what we're seeing for five estuaries substation proposals and North Falls, which I was going to come on to a bit later on in the agenda. Um, so with that in mind, is there anything that the applicant wants to say at this point?

01:06:39:09 - 01:07:19:06

Uh, Paula McGeady for the applicant. Um, I hope it has become clear, sir, that we are not proposing to compulsorily require any land for being provision as an being. You know, it's a number under the metric PNG provision and the way it's currently being interpreted interpreted on GCP planning permissions and will come into force on and. That that is not what we are proposing. Um, in terms of the, um, offer a whole route, the plot 1704 and 1705, we can set out our full reasoning and writing, but primarily we need to hold it in that location because there are sensitive land use on the cable corridor that we don't believe we should be interfering with, and therefore we need an alternative.

01:07:19:08 - 01:07:21:26

But we were happy to set that out further in writing.

01:07:22:01 - 01:07:22:24

Okay. Thank you.

01:07:33:03 - 01:07:38:00

Can I just add one point on the sensitive land use? Is that allowed?

01:07:38:12 - 01:07:40:24

Yeah. Could you get a little closer to the mic, please?

01:07:41:13 - 01:07:56:06

Tamsin fairly fatigued early. We we have sort of indicated to the applicant that whilst they think this is a sensitive land feature, we could plough it up tomorrow. It is a piece of grass. It's not subject to anything. I just want that. Noted,

01:07:57:27 - 01:08:04:02

and North Wales haven't indicated it as being an issue, so they're going to build a whole road over the top of it anyway.

01:09:15:19 - 01:09:37:26

Thank you. Then turning to Mr. Fairlie on behalf of Henry Fairlie and Son. Um. Yeah. Mr.. Do you want to come to the table and speak using one of the fixed mikes, or do you want to use a roving mic? Might be easier just to come to the table. Yeah.

01:09:50:02 - 01:10:07:04

Oh, yes, I'm Andrew Fairlie. Henry Fielding, your son. Um, we've pretty much got the same concerns as what's been reported earlier. Um, just one thing. A couple of things I would like to point out. I should have brought my other glasses. I was going to read what I wrote down. Um.

01:10:07:25 - 01:10:19:21

The hydrology in the club. Because even though I can do both distance and vision and reading with ease, my prescription is changing and I'm finding one version is not so good for reading anymore.

01:10:20:24 - 01:10:53:27

Um, yeah. The hydrology survey that was done, commissioned by the applicants, was done in the middle of the dry summer, going when all the ditches are dry and the springs aren't running. So to me, that's not worth anything because when they start construction, obviously that would be that would be damper time. So, um, the diversion route they've put in for during the widening of the Little Bentley Road, um, is down Paynes Lane, which is a dead end lane.

01:10:53:29 - 01:11:24:28

Then it goes on to one of my farm tracks. Um, so I don't quite understand how they can, uh, use a farm track for general public when it's an unmade up track as well. So that's going to be interesting. Um, so I need to visit that rather than do a desktop exercise. Um, we'll start right down here. Oh, yes. We've already got, um, tables under some of our fields and you can see where the cables are.

01:11:25:19 - 01:11:56:13

Um, because the crops don't grow as well. So it's not just a temporary effect of the project. We have long term implications of crop loss. So the the applicant is saying that they will only honour any crop loss claims for a short period. I'm afraid I don't accept because we can demonstrate longer crop loss periods because you can see them.

01:12:04:00 - 01:12:05:17

And that's pretty well all I've got to say.

01:12:11:21 - 01:12:12:20

Thank you very much.

01:12:15:21 - 01:12:42:07

Thank you. Mr.. Just to help the examining authority orientate itself with, um, your landholding in particular. Can we ask for the land plants to be brought up? Are you able to give us an indication on which sheet? Um, your landholding in particular? I see Mrs. Feliz perhaps trying to navigate, with perhaps the help of Mr. Church.

01:13:09:09 - 01:13:13:16

We think it's sheet 15. Top left hand corner.

01:13:19:13 - 01:13:20:00

Yeah.

01:13:40:25 - 01:13:57:07

So, did I say top left corner of that sheet. Is that in the area where we've got the the cable corridor running in with blue in effect left, right with a bit of yellow. North and south. Are we in that sort of area?

01:13:58:28 - 01:14:09:18

Yes. It's where you've got the two, where the cable corridor comes through. And then you've got the two compounds north and south, where it exits off the Bentley Road.

01:14:17:12 - 01:14:23:02

There's a lot of drainage. Water goes to that point because that's the lowest area of that area.

01:14:24:10 - 01:14:30:11

And the existing cables that cross your land. Do you know what they are for? Are they electrical cables? Yes.

01:14:30:13 - 01:14:33:18

They're part of the UK power networks. Main ring. Main.

01:14:37:06 - 01:14:39:13

They go three different directions. Underground.

01:14:45:10 - 01:14:52:02

The cables have actually heated up the ground because when the snow, those airlines melt first.

01:15:07:29 - 01:15:10:22

Any idea when they might have been installed?

01:15:21:03 - 01:15:21:28

I'm going to.

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

Say.

01:15:23:25 - 01:15:25:24

I think it was about 15 years ago,

01:15:27:13 - 01:15:34:05

but I could check up because the above ground main poles had come to the end of their serviceable life.

01:15:36:06 - 01:15:38:15

And so we had the option to bury them.

01:15:41:06 - 01:15:43:21

Which makes farming the land a lot easier.

01:16:18:09 - 01:16:23:09

And do you have any idea as to what sort of depth those cables were buried to?

01:16:24:18 - 01:16:43:28

Yes, because we threw the contractors off site more than once for not complying with the guidelines they were instructed to work to. They use subcontractors. And on a piece piecemeal rate or. And so I kept showing up to get along faster. So they should be at 1.2m.

01:17:14:10 - 01:17:19:11

Thank you, Mr. Fan. Did the applicant want to respond to anything that Mr. Fairley has just said?

01:17:20:15 - 01:17:53:28

Uh, the applicant um, sir, I am advised that the survey that Mr. Fairlie was referring to was not a hydrology survey. It was a walkover survey. Um, I don't have my hydrologist with me to tell me when the hydrology survey was done, but we can check that. My understanding is that particular survey was not a hydrology survey. Um, in terms of the route Mr. Fairlie has provided as feedback to us and we have looked for an alternative to the route that we do as this farm track. We are now looking to revise the TMP with an alternative route. Um, and that will be coming to you in the next version of the outline construction traffic management plan.

01:17:55:16 - 01:18:22:01

Um, there is very little I can say about other people's cables and how they have been buried. Some, unfortunately, sir, what I can see is that you will have seen it in our, um, code of construction practice, the outline for our proposed soil management, um, plan and measures and the standards that we are proposing, we are held to that there isn't an awful lot I can really say about the experience of somebody else's cables.

01:18:43:21 - 01:19:07:07

You mean spaghetti? Um, I think that then brings us to the end of hearing from the individual affected persons who are actually present here this morning. Well, I think I'm going to suggest is that we take an adjournment. Um, then I've, I've got some questions relating to this part of the agenda before we move on to the next agenda item. Um.

01:19:09:23 - 01:19:13:13

Shall we say resumption at 22?

01:19:21:29 - 01:19:29:00

Yep. 20 to 12. Okay. The hearing is therefore adjourned until 20 to 12. Thank you.