

00:00:04:21 - 00:00:28:42

Unknown

Okay. Good morning, everyone, and welcome. It's now time for me to open this issue specific hearing them before into the draft development consent order, which is being held in connection with an application made by North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park Ltd for an order for development consent for the construction operation and maintenance of the North Lincolnshire Green Energy

00:00:28:42 - 00:00:53:28

Unknown

Park Project. The development proposes the construction and operation of a combined heat and power enabled energy generating station. With an electrical output of up to 95 megawatts, incorporating carbon capture, associated district heat and private wire networks, hydrogen production, ash treatment and other associated developments.

00:00:54:34 - 00:01:17:11

Unknown

So before I go any further, can I confirm with the case team that the teams is working and I can be heard and seen and the recording and live of the event has commenced. Yes. Thank you. So for those people watching the live stream, let me explain that if the proceedings are adjourned at any point, we will

00:01:17:11 - 00:01:31:23

Unknown

have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. When the meeting is resumed, you'll need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted live stream. I'll remind you again of this should we need to adjourn.

00:01:32:47 - 00:01:50:24

Unknown

Now let me introduce myself and my colleagues. My name is Edwin Mond. I'm a chartered town planner and a planning inspector. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead member of the panel of examining inspectors that together comprise the examining authority for this application.

00:01:51:37 - 00:02:14:09

Unknown

The other member of the panel is Dr. Phil Brewer, and he'll now introduce himself to you. Thank you, Edwin. Good morning, everybody. My name is Dr. Phil Brewer. I'm a member of the Interests of Acoustics and a planning inspector and have been appointed by the Secretary of State for leveling up housing and communities as a member of

00:02:14:09 - 00:02:38:38

Unknown

the panel of examining the inspectors to examine this application. And I will now back to Mr. Moreland. We're also assisted at this hearing today by the planning inspector as case team. We have our case manager, Sarah Norris here in person, supported by Caroline Hopewell, Jenny Savage and Steve Parker remotely.

00:02:39:35 - 00:03:03:25

Unknown

If you have any questions or queries about the examination, please contact them in the first instance. Their details are on the National Infrastructure Planning website, but also on any correspondence you've received from us. Now, before I go into the main part of the hearing, I'll ask my colleague, Dr. Brewer, to highlight a few housekeeping and background matters

00:03:03:25 - 00:03:26:20

Unknown

for today. Thank you. As explained previously, the issue specific hearings will be livestreamed and recorded. The recordings will be published on the project page of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as possible after each hearing closes.

00:03:27:44 - 00:03:58:18

Unknown

To assist viewers and listeners. Anyone speaking should introduce themselves each time they speak. As the recordings are obtained and published, they form a public record that can contain personal information to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. The Roll eight letter includes a link to the Planning Inspectorate Privacy Notice, which provides further information on this topic.

00:04:00:44 - 00:04:16:23

Unknown

If there is a need to refer to information that participants would otherwise wish to be kept private and confidential, it should be in a written form which can then be redacted before being published. If you prefer not to have your image recorded, you can switch your camera off.

00:04:18:45 - 00:04:41:08

Unknown

I will repeat the request made in the arrangements conference that in order to minimize background noise, please ensure your microphone or telephone is muted and that you stay muted unless you are speaking. In order to avoid fatigue. It is our intention to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minute intervals and a longer break over lunch

00:04:41:08 - 00:05:02:38

Unknown

time period. I'll now hand back to Mr. Moore and Mr. Moore, who will outline the purpose and conduct of this issue specifically. This hearing provides an opportunity for the issues raised by interested parties and in particular the differences between them to be explored further by the examining authority.

00:05:04:02 - 00:05:25:12

Unknown

The purpose of an issue specific hearing is set out in section 91 of the Planning Act 2008. It is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary for the examination to hear oral representations to enable adequate examination of the issue, or to ensure that an interested party has a fair chance to put their case.

00:05:27:00 - 00:05:44:19

Unknown

As indicated in the agenda. Questioning at the hearing will be held by a member of the panel, supported by other panel member. It is for the examining authority to determine how hearings

are to be conducted, including the amount of time to be allowed out of the hearing for the making of a person's representations.

00:05:45:29 - 00:06:06:24

Unknown

Our aim is to use our powers of control over the conduct of hearings to ensure that they are carried out as efficiently as possible, whilst remaining fair to all parties and thorough in our examination of evidence. We've identified the matters to be considered today and those on which we require further information, and these are set out in

00:06:06:24 - 00:06:29:10

Unknown

the agenda published in advance of this hearing. Participants should note the written summaries of oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the Planning Inspectorate by deadline six, which is the 20th of March 2023. At this point, I'd like to invite parties to introduce themselves, please.

00:06:29:37 - 00:06:55:16

Unknown

Now, if I can start with the applicant that morning, says Clare Brook, on behalf of the applicant. Thank you. Francis Everett on behalf of the applicant. Laura Tanaka on behalf of the applicant. Morning, Seth. Andrew Bradley, on behalf of the applicants.

00:06:56:20 - 00:07:18:17

Unknown

Thank you very much. I come next to North Lincolnshire Council. Thank you, says Andrew Lawler on behalf of North Lincolnshire Council. Thank you. And I believe we have the Environment Agency online. Annette Hewitson, representing the Environment Agency. Thank you.

00:07:20:03 - 00:07:37:03

Unknown

Now, if there are other people in attendance today who I've not come to, I won't ask you to introduce yourselves now. But the first time you are invited to speak, please can you introduce yourself by giving your name and the name or names of the organization that you represent?

00:07:38:34 - 00:07:54:21

Unknown

I hope everyone's had the chance to read the detailed agenda for this hearing, and during today we have questions for the applicant and other invited parties. I'm aware there are a number of interested parties may wish to speak on some of the items.

00:07:55:30 - 00:08:11:17

Unknown

Once I've finished my direct questioning, I will ask if interested parties would like to make any submission relating to that agenda item before moving to my next direct questioning on the next agenda item. Again, just remind everyone this is an issue.

00:08:11:18 - 00:08:32:39

Unknown

Specific hearing and submissions made already should relate only to the agenda items that we are discussing. I would reassure everyone that your previous submissions have been read and noted. I understand there may be other issues not on the agenda that parties may wish to raise, but submissions on these matters should be made in writing by deadline six

00:08:33:13 - 00:08:55:30

Unknown

, again the 20th of March 2023. So thank you in advance for that. So to try and aid those taking part and following the documents, we are likely to refer to the draft development consent order, which was submitted at deadline five, which is in the exam library reference Rep 5005.

00:08:55:30 - 00:09:21:36

Unknown

And that's the clean version, the explanatory memorandum, which is Rep 5007. Again, that's the clean version. When I say clean there, there are tract versions for those that are less familiar, a statement of reasons, which is Rep 5011 and then the works plans, C-3, which is Rep 5015.

00:09:23:46 - 00:09:47:04

Unknown

Any page number reference we make at the hearing today will relate to the electronic version of the document, not a paper version. So if we then can come on to item three, which is starting off looking at the articles and schedules of the draft of the consent order, I'll just invite the applicant to briefly provide an overview

00:09:47:04 - 00:10:03:29

Unknown

of the changes to the articles of the DCO, including the reasons for those changes and since issue specific hearing to I think in the agenda, we'd originally said three, but it's correct to ask for two because that was the last DCO hearing.

00:10:06:07 - 00:10:35:17

Unknown

Thank you, sir. Claire Brook. On behalf of the applicant, just to introduce the various documents which constitute the changes that have been made to the DCO. Firstly, issue specific hearing two was held on the 17th of November, and since that date, amended versions of the draft DCO were submitted at deadline to on the 15th of December.

00:10:35:18 - 00:10:53:25

Unknown

That was revision to. DEADLINE fall on the 7th of February, which was revision three, and then finally deadline five on the 21st of February, which was revision four. And so, as you say, the latest version is therefore revision four.

00:10:54:07 - 00:11:18:16

Unknown

You've given the reference for that REP 5005. At the same time as providing each revised draft at each separate deadline. Since issue specific sharing two, we've also provided a schedule of changes. And each time we provide a schedule of changes, we consolidate that.

00:11:19:04 - 00:11:42:45

Unknown

So with the revision for changes which were set out in table 1.4 of the schedule of changes, we actually have a consolidated set of all of the changes that have been made. It is made at each stage. And the reason for that change and the consequence for that change set out in those tables.

00:11:43:44 - 00:11:56:44

Unknown

Now if it would be helpful. Selby I'll be led by you in terms of how much detail I go into for that, for the summary. What I can do is, is highlight the main changes that took place at each revision, if that would be helpful.

00:11:57:07 - 00:12:17:00

Unknown

I think you would. Thank you. Yes, I can do that. So at revision two, which was submitted on the 15th of December following the hearing, the definition of maintained maintain was amended. And that was specifically in response to your first round of questions.

00:12:19:39 - 00:12:38:29

Unknown

Secondly, Article 11 was amended to provide that the undertaker must restore any street that has been temporarily altered under the article to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority, and then also to include some similar wording in Article 12 to that provided under Article 11.

00:12:40:00 - 00:13:03:08

Unknown

Such that they can't be exercised without Nelson's consent, which cannot be unreasonably withheld. These amendments were made specifically to address comments from NLC and the Local Impact Report. And I appreciate we come back to those on the agenda as well, so we can provide more detail if required.

00:13:04:48 - 00:13:27:41

Unknown

Article 43. Was amended to narrow. This was in relation to the defense to proceedings for statutory nuisance, which I appreciate is also on today's agenda. That was amended to narrow down the specific nuisances that are referenced in section 79 of the EPA to which any defense would apply.

00:13:28:33 - 00:13:50:12

Unknown

And again, that was done partly following the issue specific caring to, but also specific questions raised by yourselves. The works were also updated in response to your first round of questions, specifically in relation to the footbridges and the user worked crossings and the elevated walkway.

00:13:50:47 - 00:14:15:48

Unknown

So amendments were made to. Provide clarity with respect to those. We also amended other authorized developments as set out in part two of Schedule one, and that was again updated in response to your first round of questions. And that was a narrowing of what we were seeking in terms of that category of other authorized development.

00:14:16:00 - 00:14:40:12

Unknown

You'll recall it was a fairly widely drafted provision. We then had some amendments to requirement eight where we added in some additional consultations. In particular, the local flood authority, the IDB and the EIA were added to requirement eight.

00:14:41:12 - 00:15:04:02

Unknown

The local flood authority was added as a consultee for requirement 12. And again, that was in specific response to one of your questions. Requirement 15. You recall we substituted the waste hierarchy requirement, which again appears on today's agenda, and that was in response to your questions.

00:15:06:08 - 00:15:34:07

Unknown

Requirement 19 was also amended to include a requirement to report annually on the carbon dioxide that is captured in the facility. And that was in direct response to your first round of questions. And then finally in revision to a new requirement, 20 was added in relation to the commitments regarding the construction of the railway reinstatement works and

00:15:34:07 - 00:16:05:42

Unknown

again in response to your initial questions. Turning then to revision three, Article 15 was amended to provide that any temporary public rights of way were to remain in place until the relevant temporarily suspended public right of way is again open for use and to provide a 28 day notice period for NLC in relation to those temporary stopping

00:16:05:42 - 00:16:37:09

Unknown

ups. This was at the request of NLC. Further. A new Article 40 in relation to the removal of human remains. A standard article was added following comments made at issue specific three. In relation to work number one, in schedule one, we've added specific reference to the visual barrier required to be in place.

00:16:37:25 - 00:17:00:14

Unknown

And again, I appreciate we'll come to that on the agenda. This is a mitigation measure which is referred to in Chapter 11, the landscape and visual assessment, and also Chapter 19 on the mitigation. It was added to the works to specifically demonstrate the commitment for that to be built as part of the energy park works.

00:17:03:12 - 00:17:30:37

Unknown

We also added to work number one, the reference, the correct reference to the trade effluent treatment plant. Work. Number 15. Was also amended and we split that out. You'll note into works number 15 A and 15 B, this is to do with the compound areas and this was to reflect the amendments being made to the works plan

00:17:31:21 - 00:18:07:42

Unknown

and particular. We've added the Environment Agency as a specific consultee for requirement nine on file water drainage. Again at the agency's request. Requirement 11 on archeology. Was amended to reflect a specific requirement put forward by NLC. And then with further bespoke amendments to make sure it fits with our particular scheme.

00:18:12:15 - 00:18:33:37

Unknown

Requirement 12 in relation to flood risk. Was amended to provide for the submission of a detailed flood mitigation strategy, again at the request of the Environment Agency, to deal with the approval of the flood risk assessment as part of the design process for the construction of the facility.

00:18:33:38 - 00:18:57:36

Unknown

And you'll recall that requirement 12 then also addresses management of flood risk during operations as well. And then finally in revision three. Requirement 16 was amended to make it clear that the decommissioning plan will include flood risk as well, again at the request of the Environment Agency.

00:19:07:45 - 00:19:33:22

Unknown

And then turning to the final set of revisions and revision for. So the latest version that we are now talking to today. Reference has been included to the IDB, the internal drainage board. To Article 47 one. Again, that was at the specific request of the Water Management Board, the Scunthorpe and Gainesville Water Management Board.

00:19:38:15 - 00:20:04:17

Unknown

Further amendments have been made to requirements three, six and eight. These were to reflect the changes in the updated design principles and codes. Document revision to which for your benefit is read 5017. The updated Design Codes and Principles document that was submitted at deadline five.

00:20:07:28 - 00:20:29:25

Unknown

Sorry. At Rep 5017. Requirement 11 on archeology, we made some further tweaks to the names of the specific documents that will be submitted to reflect the further discussions that we've had with NLC. So just some clarity on terminology that.

00:20:32:08 - 00:20:55:13

Unknown

And then finally, with respect to requirement 15 on the waste hierarchy. We've amended that to delete in particular the reference to the need to provide an annual waste composition analysis. This was following comments from both NLC and UK when it deadline for.

00:20:55:33 - 00:21:17:11

Unknown

With respect to that particular requirement and also in acknowledgment of what will be included on the face of the environmental permit. So to avoid duplication there as well. So hopefully that is an efficient summary of where we're at.

00:21:17:41 - 00:21:40:05

Unknown

Happy to answer any further questions you may have. Thank you. And I don't have any particular questions. It's helpful summing up of where we've got to and why we've got to. So thank you for that. And I think really, then it comes on to.

00:21:44:06 - 00:22:11:49

Unknown

Our first question, I suppose if the audiovisual team can show work, plan C three, please. And, and so really what I'm trying to get to is an understanding of the footbridges and the parameters that control them, because at the moment there are not any specific parameters mentioned within the DCO itself.

00:22:13:12 - 00:22:36:47

Unknown

And when we asked the first written question on this, which was 7.1. 15 and the response indicated that the applicant would provide updated indicative railway drawings to me more clearly indicate the location of the footbridges and I'm not sure we've received those.

00:22:37:48 - 00:23:01:13

Unknown

And so that's why I'm going to end up asking a series of questions, because it's still unclear exactly what we're dealing with. So if we can go on to the next image. Thank you. So this is a zoomed in extract from and.

00:23:04:15 - 00:23:24:23

Unknown

The submitted plans, which is showing the section through one of the footbridges. So are you able to tell me what the maximum height of the bridge would be? In recognizing that there would be a one meter allowance either up or down.

00:23:29:08 - 00:23:46:33

Unknown

So Claybrook, on behalf of the applicant, before I defer to one of our team in particular, yes, you are correct that we haven't yet submitted the indicative or the updated indicative railway drawings and that that was an oversight on our part.

00:23:46:34 - 00:24:13:07

Unknown

And we will submit updated drawings where we've had discussion as a team and a draft set of drawings have been prepared but not yet submitted to yourself. So we'll make sure that we rectify that following today's hearing and your correct to cross refer in particular to the limits of deviation in Article five, where we do make specific

00:24:13:07 - 00:24:36:06

Unknown

reference to the maximum one meter upwards of one meter downwards by reference to the parameters shown on the indicative railway plans as currently shown. They don't show the parameters for the bridge and we will provide updated drawings that will show those parameters so that you can then see the specific heights.



00:24:36:46 - 00:24:54:30

Unknown

But if you would like, I suspect Mr. Pile or Mr. Gallup, who I think we have both online today, could clarify the technical position in terms of where we're at with that, I think Mr. Gallop has come on screen, so I'll pass over to Mr. Gallop.

00:24:56:14 - 00:25:17:35

Unknown

Good morning. Says they galloped for the applicant. The starting point is railway group standards, the defined clearances of any overlying structure above a fixed rail level to allow for the passage of the train with or without overhead electrification or to standards, depending on whether it's with or without.

00:25:18:19 - 00:25:37:02

Unknown

So the cross sections that you have in front of you at the moment show the position of the railway line at a point on those sections in blue. And we've we've indicated above that a dotted line which shows the minimum clearance between the top of the rail level and the underside of the bridge soffit level.

00:25:38:21 - 00:26:02:36

Unknown

Which is 4.24 meters. That 4.2 feet, four meters is defined by railway group standards as the minimum clearance between the top of rail and the soffit level of the of the structure going over the top. Now, because there is little likelihood of the line ever being electrified, we've used the standard that the railway group standards have and

00:26:02:36 - 00:26:21:46

Unknown

is industry standard for that 4.24 meter clearance from top of rail to underside of structure. Above that, what you'll find in the in the revised drawing that that we will send through is not only a reference to where that standard comes from within railway group standards, because we can put that on the drawing.

00:26:22:26 - 00:26:39:34

Unknown

But also we've included an additional provision above soffit level for the height of the parapet. So you've got that the envelope defined between the railway line and the top of the parapet and the parapet. We've put a notional 2.15 meters in.

00:26:40:01 - 00:26:53:35

Unknown

As advised by other colleagues in the team on the engineering side so that the drawing was sent through will show the space envelope and the standard that sets the difference. The clearance between the railway line and the underside of the structure.

00:26:59:04 - 00:27:22:00

Unknown

And in terms of the height of the parapet. So that's providing a safety fence, for want of a better phrase, either side of the the bridge and and is the 2.15 the maximum that's seen to be necessary the minimum minimum or where's that figure coming from?

00:27:23:27 - 00:27:36:27

Unknown

I think at this stage we've taken advice from elsewhere in the team. We will double check that 2.15 meter dimension to understand the source of that from colleagues. And and if there's any change to it, we'll let you know.

00:27:36:27 - 00:28:02:07

Unknown

But I'd say at the moment, the working assumption has been for a fixed parapet either side of the bridge itself of 2.15 meters. But we'll confirm that on the drawing. So. Thank you. And ultimately, where I'd like to get to is an understanding of if the examining authority felt it necessary to put within the table of the

00:28:02:08 - 00:28:26:18

Unknown

DCO, the recommended DCO, a a figure for the vertical height of the bridge. What would that be? I appreciate you may not agree with that at this stage, but I'd like to know what that is in the event that we deem it necessary to do it and equally be the same for the the lateral dimension.

00:28:27:12 - 00:28:52:36

Unknown

And so that we and everybody subsequently will know exactly what the maximum dimensions of both these bridges would be. I don't want to guess it to figure and that cause everybody a major headache further down the line. But equally, I'd be interested to hear your view on whether you think that's an appropriate addition to the DCO to

00:28:52:36 - 00:29:22:05

Unknown

make it clear to everybody. And I think this goes on to my sort of subsequent question that's arising to me in that when we'd asked for assessment of your view on what the Yes has actually saw the environmental statement, what the dimensions were that were used to inform that in terms of the visual effect of the bridge

00:29:22:18 - 00:29:53:10

Unknown

or bridges and any ecological effects. We've had a written response explaining that. I would really like confirmation that that has been done on the basis of the dimensions that you're now specifying, because a 2.15 parapet for 4.24 meters in the air is potentially quite high bulky structure perhaps.

00:29:53:44 - 00:30:15:12

Unknown

Obviously, we don't have any visual representations of it, but I just want to make sure that we're not inadvertently missing anything. So, yes, completely. And so Claybrook, on behalf of the applicant, I see that Kevin Murphy is on line.

00:30:15:12 - 00:30:29:32

Unknown

But acknowledging what you have just indicated with respect to the environmental statement, I'm sure that we will be in a position to provide that update and that confirmation. I don't know if Kevin wants to add any further to that.

00:30:30:42 - 00:30:45:36

Unknown

I suspect not at this stage, but I completely acknowledge what is required there. Thank you. So if we can note that that was an action point and following on from today and it covers being provided in writing, explaining the situation.

00:30:46:49 - 00:31:08:15

Unknown

Thank you. I've obviously mentioned already the lateral dimensions again, Mr. Gallup. Are you the best person to advise on what the lateral dimensions are likely to be or will, or within what parameters they're likely to be in? And will it be the same for both bridges?

00:31:10:20 - 00:31:22:09

Unknown

I'm going to defer on that, if you don't mind, said Nick Elliott for the three, the applicant. I will confer with colleagues and we'll come back on that one, because others in the team have been looking at the overall structures themselves.

00:31:22:09 - 00:31:50:43

Unknown

We've just been looking at the clearances to ensure that trainees can get through. All right. Thank you. And one of the other elements that are mindful of is that in again written question responds. The confirmation was, I think there would be ramps on the bridges to allow for access for people with disabilities.

00:31:51:43 - 00:32:14:14

Unknown

So again, I'm just interested in understanding what the consequential visual effects of that might be, but also and what effects that has on the dimensions of the bridges. I'm sort of slightly going off the tangent here, but it's probably sensible to mention it now.

00:32:14:34 - 00:32:38:39

Unknown

We've obviously got the compulsory acquisition hearings tomorrow. We need to be certain that the ramps, as well as the entrance and exit points for the rail bridges can stay within the land that has been identified, particularly where on one of them it's going into an area that's identified as open space at the moment.

00:32:38:39 - 00:33:06:26

Unknown

I think that's correct. And we obviously I just want to make sure that that is going to be the situation. Claire Brook on behalf of the applicants. Yes, we will double check that position to a degree. The lateral parameters, as you rightly say, are constrained by the red lines on the railway sections where the foot of

00:33:06:26 - 00:33:26:23

Unknown

the foot bridge locations and you'll see the build out of the the red line to reflect those locations. But we will confirm both aspects in terms of consequential visual effects, but also impacts on the dimensions too. I know that we have had the ramps in mind and certainly when we've had discussions as a team, we have and

00:33:26:29 - 00:33:40:09

Unknown

as far as I'm aware, I've been able to confirm it's within those parameters and there's no concerns that I'm aware of at this stage. No, nobody's identified. It's just me having a moment and I just want to make sure that there isn't a problem.

00:33:41:04 - 00:34:06:42

Unknown

You know, whilst there may be some time to do it, deal with it if there was one. Yeah. Thank you, sir. Thank you, everyone, for that. And whilst we're on this subject, then can I just draw the attention to the submitted application guide, which the latest version is REP 5003 and am the document reference that you include

00:34:06:43 - 00:34:24:36

Unknown

within the application guide for the Indicative Railway drawings. And you say there was a version submitted on the 12th of January 2023, which is deadline three, but that's not in the examination library. So I think that that's possibly an error.

00:34:24:36 - 00:34:47:08

Unknown

It was perhaps the date it was intended to be submitted, correct? So. Yes, yes. I am. There's an other issue which I'll come to later within the guy, and you may be something you've already picked up, but I think it would be helpful for everybody if there's an extra column added to the guide which has the exam

00:34:47:08 - 00:35:09:05

Unknown

library reference. And then that potentially avoids allows us both to cross-reference that the things you have submitted have arrived. And at the moment, obviously without that exam library reference, I was squirreling around thinking, you know, where is this document?

00:35:09:05 - 00:35:25:32

Unknown

And it obviously hasn't been submitted. So I think that would be a helpful addition if that could be done. Yes, I'm sure we can do that. And apologies for the confusion. It's fine. We all know how complicated these things are, keeping track on everything.

00:35:26:14 - 00:35:42:28

Unknown

And can I then just come to the council to see if they've got any additional comments they would want to make on this particular topic item? Thank you, sir. Andre Loaf and All Things Council. No questions on this topic item.

00:35:42:29 - 00:36:18:07

Unknown

Thank you. Right. And any other interested party either in the room or remotely. Got any concerns or additional issues they would want to raise them on this item? No. Okay. If I can then move on. And the next item, if a team can show plan figure A1 from App 59, which is the landscape and visual impact

00:36:20:06 - 00:37:03:33

Unknown

section of the environmental statement. Thank you. So this is an extract from the environmental statement showing a view from advocates towards the proposed development. And what I was just wanting to discuss here was the visual barrier. And I don't know how clearly people can see it on the screens, but just in front of the building is a

00:37:03:33 - 00:37:34:19

Unknown

light brown wall, I suppose is perhaps the simplest description. And obviously this, I think, is now what is specifically being mentioned and introduced into the description of development in Schedule one. So what I just wanted to clarify is whether you could explain to me what height that is assumed to be when and that was prepared.

00:37:38:06 - 00:38:14:41

Unknown

Clever on behalf of the applicant. I'll start by making a couple of references to various documents. Firstly, with respect to the landscape and visual chapter in particular at paragraph 7.1.1.8. Sorry, I'm actually referring to chapter 19, the mitigation chapter, which is AP 67, which cross refers back to the mitigation required in the landscape.

00:38:14:41 - 00:38:40:11

Unknown

And visual assessment is the accumulation of all of the mitigation. So paragraph 7.1.1.8 of Section seven of the landscape official chapter does make specific reference in terms of the architectural design that will be required at the detailed design stage and refers there to the substantive visual barrier.

00:38:42:04 - 00:39:06:00

Unknown

And the reference for the purposes of the assessment states that this would need to be a visually impermeable barrier of at least three meters. And height and should be colored or textured to reflect the river edge. The way in which that is that mitigation is secured is via DCO requirement.

00:39:06:04 - 00:39:37:01

Unknown

Three. In terms of the detailed design and hence also why we then made specific reference to it as part of the works. In addition to that. The Design Principles and Codes Revision to Document Rep five zero 17. Also includes as part of one of these specific design codes, which is DC RC 5.02.

00:39:38:11 - 00:39:58:31

Unknown

That also makes specific reference to the visually impermeable barrier of at least three meters high to be installed along the western and eastern edge of the development platform for the

ERF. So again, that provides another mechanism for securing that as part of the detailed design.

00:40:00:21 - 00:40:18:30

Unknown

Mr. Murphy is on line if there should be any further questions in terms of how we address that through the landscape chapter. But those are the parameters that have been reference. I don't like to disagree with you, but I don't think that's a parameter because it's a minimum.

00:40:19:20 - 00:40:37:04

Unknown

It says at least three meters, there's no maximum. So I go back to my original question. When the plan or that image was prepared is is that indicating to me a three meter high structure or something different? And.

00:40:40:03 - 00:41:00:05

Unknown

We will need to clarify that. I don't know if Mr. Murphy is able to clarify that today. I don't think we have our landscape and visual expert online this morning. We can certainly try and clarify that during the break and or by deadline six, but absolutely accept that at least three meters high, as is the minimum height

00:41:00:35 - 00:41:17:26

Unknown

. We haven't provided a maximum parameter for that. The purpose of that visual barrier and the reason for setting it as I understand it at the three meter minimum is that it is to shield the activity. So in terms of TVs and the comings and goings.

00:41:17:40 - 00:41:34:34

Unknown

So clearly it's not to shield the visual parameters of the facility itself is the activity that it relates to and hence why the minimum of three meters will set for the purposes of that assessment. But we haven't explicitly dealt with a maximum parameter.

00:41:36:13 - 00:42:05:20

Unknown

Mean, I understand that it's not intended to screen the buildings. It's the activities beyond. But and if I can go to the next plan, please, because what this comes from the design and access statement and it's electronic page 54 Design and Act statement, access statement, revision one, which is Rep three zero 12.

00:42:06:07 - 00:42:41:40

Unknown

Now I'm I just wanted to ask, is the visual barrier shown on this set of drawings? Because if you. And look at the bottom drawing. There is a barrier shown on the bottom section drawings, a barrier shown which is described as and I can't read it from here, but it let me just I've got it on my

00:42:41:40 - 00:43:17:49

Unknown

computer. Just bear with me a second so I can read it. Yeah. Is described as retaining wall. Stroke visual barrier. So is that am I looking at the right thing or is that somewhere else? Claire Brooke On behalf of Applicant, at this point, I will need to defer to Mr. Powell, who I think is on line in

00:43:17:49 - 00:43:37:27

Unknown

terms of the author of the dos. And if we can't clarify that now, then we will take that point away. Thank you. Good morning, says Robert Paul on behalf of the applicant. Just confirm your interpretation of that. Illustrative section is correct.

00:43:38:25 - 00:44:00:43

Unknown

Figure 5.22 of the DAS. The the vertical black line is to illustrate the location of the visual barrier, which is shown of the this section of figure 5.20 up above on the right top right hand side, the image that you had up earlier.

00:44:06:16 - 00:44:35:21

Unknown

Right. This is where I start to get confused. When you look at the top three drawings, which are numbered 518, five, 19, five, 25, 25, 19 has a section numbered fig 520. But I think that's wrong because the section is, I think 521 below is the numbering has gone a bit squishy.

00:44:37:02 - 00:44:57:39

Unknown

And then on the drawing number, the top right hand corner, which is described as Figure 520, has a section saying figure 5 to 1. So should that be 5 to 2 and. Robert Paul on behalf of the applicant.

00:44:58:12 - 00:45:19:34

Unknown

Yes, sir. That is a drafting area. On the on the figure on the section figure cross-references this as you've highlighted, so we can get the update. So the one in the top right hand corner, which is Figure 20, which on the inset has a reference to section figure 5.21 that should be, as you pointed out, section figure

00:45:19:34 - 00:45:45:39

Unknown

5.22, which shows a cross reference through the rail heads and the rail corridor, which is the the section on the bottom of that page. Thank you. And, you know, that's helpful if that can be just resolved. So if I can go then to the section above the middle one and.

00:45:48:37 - 00:46:11:31

Unknown

Is the visual barrier on on that drawing or is it not in that location? Robert Powell, on behalf of the applicant? No, it's not on that section. It doesn't come as far south as that. The visual barrier is located along the western extents of the platforms, the IRF building.

00:46:14:47 - 00:46:49:32

Unknown

Right. Do we have a plan showing the extent of the visual barrier? I don't know whether you heard me, Mr. Powell. He's frozen. Either that or he's nodded off, and I thought he was waiting for me to interject.

00:46:53:06 - 00:47:24:19

Unknown

Ah, he's lost Internet, apparently. Well, perhaps if I leave that with you, because again, I'm coming back to the same point I made earlier about needing to understand clearly the extent, the visual barrier, both laterally and vertically, and whether that should again be specified in the table within the DCO with maximums, you know, parameters clearly controlled.

00:47:36:49 - 00:48:10:07

Unknown

We? For those in the room. I understand there's a bit of a technical glitch, so those out of the room are no longer with us. So I think we're just going to need to take a pause just to see whether that is going to be an easy remedy to fix.

00:48:10:10 - 00:48:39:00

Unknown

So if we just wait a few moments, hopefully that can be resolved. Okay. I think what we do is 10 to 11. If we take a 15 minute break, people can grab a coffee and stretch their legs. So for those on the live stream, just remind you that you'll need to switch your browser, change your browser, refresh

00:48:39:00 - 00:48:50:33

Unknown

your browser when you come back. And we'll just take a pause now until 11:05 and hope the technical issue is resolved in the meantime. So thank you, everyone, for your patience.