

TEXT_RAMPION2_ISH1_SESSION1_070224

00:16

Good morning, everybody. Can y'all hear me loud and clear? And has the live stream commenced, please? Yes, thank you. It's now past nine. Welcome to this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by rampion. Extension limited for the proposed rampion to offshore wind farm, which is now open. My name is Richard Allen. I'm a chartered town planner. I'm an examining inspector appointed by the Secretary of State's to be the lead member of the panel of inspectors to examine this application. And if I could ask my colleagues to introduce themselves, please.

00:59

Good morning. My name is Steven Rani. I'm a chartered planner and member of the royal Town Planning Institute. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this examining authority for this application.

01:11

Good morning. My name is Claire below. I'm a chartered scientist environmentalist. And I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the examining authority for this application.

01:22

Good morning. My name is Joe Sullivan. I'm a chartered town planner. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the examining authority for this application.

01:35

Good morning. My name is Richard Morgan. I'm a chartered engineer and a fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the examining authority for this application.

01:49

And together we constitute the examining authority for this application. So for those joining this morning online in the arrangement conference, and those of you who've arrived in the room this morning, you will have already spoken to Lily Robins, who is the case manager for this project. And she's supported by other colleagues from the case team out of the planning Inspectorate. And before we get onto the agenda this morning, I do have a fair bit of introductions to do. And it will take a little bit of time, but please bear with me. Firstly, just some housekeeping, can I please make sure that your mobile phones are either off or switch to Silent please. Toilets are unfortunately for those of you not here yesterday, right back in the reception area, the lobby area where you came in. In now unfortunately. So back where you came from. We are not aware of any fire alarm testing today. So if the fire alarm was to go off, it is the real thing. And the fire exit as I understand it is out the door to the right and then first left, and that will take us out of the building. I'm also aware as I said yesterday that this room was accessible by stairs, it would have been favourable, I think the room had been not accessible by stairs, it was straight off the ground floor but it is what it is. Does anybody aware of anyone who had difficulty

or was unable to access this room? Now, okay, thank you. Now, at yesterday's preliminary meeting, I stated that there may be many of you here today who have never encountered a national infrastructure project before or likely to again and we recognise that the process may be daunting, particularly with the quantum of documents that are available with such an application. And you may want to seek clarification of who we are, and the our role in this in this examination. Now we are appointed by the Secretary of State for the Department of levelling up Housing and Communities to examine this application in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. Our role is to examine the following. Whether the application complies with relevant legislation, policy and guidance, the power sought by the applicant including that relation to land rights, how the proposed development would be controlled the balance between the benefits and dis benefits of the proposed development and ultimately, whether the development consent should be granted. The XA will gather the evidence needed to help us consider these matters during the examination. And we will then submit our report and recommendation to the Secretary of State for energy security and Net Zero, who will be the ultimate decision maker on whether to grant consent or withhold consent. And I do stress that it is the Secretary of State that makes the decision ultimately on this application Throughout the process, we will be supported by the planning Spectras case team. And they will answer any initial queries that you have arising from this process or the examination process itself. The XA has decided to hold this first issue specific hearing because we wish to ask a number of important and relevant questions in these early stages of the examination to better aid our understanding and to seek clarification of the issues. The agenda is a high level one and at an early stage of the examination. This is normal. Because as the examination progresses, the issue should become narrower and the questions more focused. We heard yesterday that some interested parties wanted to when discussing this agenda, to discuss individual issues and individual sites. While of course the XA wishes to hear those issues, I think it's important at this stage that you first submit your written representation on the matter where you can set out your your specific concern. The examining authority can then decide whether we need to ask written questions on the matter and or discuss it at the May hearings. If I could remind all interested parties. If a matter is not scheduled on the agenda today, it does not mean that the matter is done and dusted. Or that the XA has made up his mind on the matter already. It is likely that the XA will have sufficient written information doesn't need to ask anything at this stage in advance of written representations. Now the purpose of today's for the examining authority to examine the information submitted by the applicant and also by interested parties and others. As a result, I would like to reassure you that we are familiar with the documents that you have sent in. So in answering a question you do not need to repeat at length, something that you've already submitted. If you want to refer to information already submitted, I'd be very grateful if you could give the appropriate pins examination Library Reference. And throughout the day, I think we will be referring to such documents. Could I please ask the first time you use an abbreviation or acronym that you give the full title as there may be people here today, or listening on listening to the live feed or on online that may not be familiar with such acronyms as you are? Now the hearing today is a structured discussion which I and other members of the examining authority will lead on based on the agenda that has already been published and which I'll go through in a few moments. Throughout the day, certain issues will reoccurs we examine them from different angles, or in relation to different elements of the scheme. I therefore ask you to bear this in mind today. When you give your evidence and ask that you focus only on answering the question that you've been asked for the purpose of identification and ease of reference could every time you wish to speak Could you please give us your name and if so whom you represent. Now we're conducting this meeting in accordance with sections 91

and 94 of the Planning Act and the infrastructure planning examination procedure rules 2010. Specifically rule 14. Now you're reminded that the Act allows the examining authority to refuse representations made at the hearing. If the examining authority considers that the representations are irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, relate to the merits of policy and are set out in a national policy statement and I will return to that particular matter. In a few moments. Repeat other representations already made, or relate to compensation for compulsory acquisition of land or an interest in all rights over land. Now, as I've already previously stated, The hearing is being recorded. The only official record of the proceedings is this recording which will be uploaded to the inspectors website. As soon as practicable after this hearing. I still call it tweets. I don't know if it's still called tweets or not, but tweets, blogs, similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted into this as evidence into this examination. So I'd now like to turn to the agenda for today please. Rule 14 Two of the examination procedures requires that at the start of the hearing, the examining authority shall identify matters to be considered at the hearing. We published a high level agenda on the 14th of December 2023 with our rules six letter and a further one last week in more detail. But I just want to before I go for it just remind you again, that the agenda is set up by the XA and contains matters we wish to discuss today. If a topic you were hoping was not discussed it's not going to discuss on the agenda today it is not an admission of should normally be taken that the XA considers the matter unimportant, or that we have already made our minds up on it. This is the matters on the agenda are those that we wish to discuss at this moment in time. I do want to be very, very clear on that, that other matters, we may want to ask written questions on or hold discussion matter on the May hearings. So the agenda is divided into two sections, it's an onshore and offshore, we will discuss the onshore elements today and the offshore tomorrow, regardless of what time we finished the day unless it goes on very, very late, but hopefully not we are going to make a few adjustments to the running order as follows. So today's order will run as it is. So we will deal with the proposed development alternatives first, followed by wider traffic and asset access issues. We will then discuss the effects of the proposed development at Cal fold and oakdene. We then have some questions on the construction effects of the proposed development including trenchless crossing will then look at the issues affecting the South Downs National Park. And there will be a discussion on other landscape effects. Now the excise decided rather than at the end of the day going through the action points arising out of this meeting, we will do action points at the end of each agenda item when it's fresh in our mind.

11:42

We ask that the applicant keep a note of the action points. And we will ask the applicant to go through those action points at the end of each agenda item and it's all fresh in our memories. So if you could keep a note of that as we go through that and we'll ask you at the end of each item to go through them. Tomorrow morning when we deal with offshore at the applicants request. We're going to deal with commercial fishing and shipping and navigation first, purely because the applicants experts are unavailable mid morning and latter part of the day. So we will deal with items 13 and 14 first, and then we will move on to the remainder part of the agenda. So ornithology will follow that as set out. Now the last item to be dealt with tomorrow, or possibly Friday morning, depending on how we get on is the draft development consent order. And I'm aware that the applicant did request or did ask for some additional information as to what items we might be discussing about draft development consent order. And I'm prepared to give you the headlines now if you if that would be helpful to you in preparation for tomorrow. So I want to talk about the article two definitions. I will have some clarifications on Article

Seven regards to rampion one powers. My main questions will be on part five on compulsory acquisition powers. The power sought in those articles and particularly the issues of covenants. I will ask you about article 43 on trees. There will inevitably be some questions on part three on requirements. I'll be asking for an update on protected provisions. And I will be asking you to outline something I think you talked about your standard preliminary meeting which has to do with legal agreements. And I'll be asking for an updated position on that. I may have some other minor or general questions outside of that. But that's the main issues that I'm proposing to talk about. I will not be discussing the deme marine licence tomorrow. This is because I note from relevant representations from Natural England and the marine management organisation. There are a considerable number of and some detail matters of concern with it. And the XA has decided to allow the applicant and those parties more time to resolve those matters before we before we need to ask any questions. And I think it's hope the XA is expecting some considerable progress to be made on the deemed marine licence at the next submission of the DCO and D marine licence. We may have written questions and we may hold a specific deemed marine licence hearing at the May hearings if we need to. Now the XA is not scheduling a compulsory acquisition hearing this for this week. And again, this is because the XA would like to read further the written representations of those parties. Before we decide on whether matters need to be discussed orally. However, at the open floor hearing yesterday, the XA heard multiple times from various parties on the absence of adequate consultation being undertaken, specifically post submission. Now, this is of some concern to the XA. And we may well discussed this briefly when various items on the agenda. But I did want to stress to the applicant particularly in relation to land rights, that the applicant cannot and should not solely rely on the Planning Act to obtain the necessary powers it needs. The Secretary of State will only exercise those powers as a last resort, and will expect agreement on all the vast majority of plots that are needed for compulsory acquisition, or at least a demonstration of considerable discussion taking place. It's perfectly feasible that the Secretary of State may not grant ca powers. If this has not been demonstrated, I will leave it there with the applicant. But the XA will expect significant progress on engagement both in CA and other terms in the in the coming deadlines. I don't propose to dwell on that any further just to leave it with the applicant. We have a list of those parties who have requested to speak to the above items, and we will invite you to speak at the appropriate time. However, should an interested party wish to raise a question? The essay will hear that at the end. We will seek to allocate sufficient time for each issue to allow proper discussion of them. We will look to take a break around 11 o'clock this morning. For about 1520 minutes we'll see on the time and lunch about one o'clock. And we will look to take an afternoon break probably around half past three. If for medical and other reasons. Anyone that requires a break, please could you let the case team know and we will attempt to meet your needs. Should the consideration of the issues take less time than anticipated? As stated we will adjourn today's hearing as after the discussions of the onshore questions. Equally, if they take longer than anticipated it may be necessary for the XA to alter the agenda and remove areas for discussion and defer to written questions. The agenda is challenging, and we want to get through a lot of information. And to assist us in this task in the X the X they will try to keep pace of discussion going and will resist repetitive comments being made. We hope that you will understand us and assist us in that process. It's important we get the right answers to the questions that we're going to ask. Therefore, if you cannot answer a question that is being asked of you at this time,

17:42

please

17:44

deferred defer it's writing plays and put it in at the next deadline. Okay, so I'm now going to go through the attendance list and those who are here, this is going to take a little bit of time. So please bear with me. So I will start with the applicant. And whether male, you're going to introduce your team or introduce your team at the point that you need to call them. How do you how do you wish to do this? Thank

18:18

you. So poor mail for the the applicant, what I was intending to do, as you will have seen so sat behind me. And along the table, there were a large number of attendees from the applicant, I was going to introduce them on a agenda item by agenda item basis depending on who's speaking to that agenda item so that we can do those introductions once and then I'll sort of indicate who will be speaking on each agenda item as we go through. That's probably the most effective way of doing it. So yes,

18:45

I think I agree with you so so as as is usual with these all questions, we all questions will be posed to you then mail. And then you can introduce the person you need to their time have

18:59

been in detail as we go down introduce themselves, but also the team will indicate which areas they are covering. So you will be able to direct questions to them as long as that as appropriate and follow up to the points that they've raised.

19:12

Thank you. So I'll start I'm going to start again with the local authorities. And I'll start with our Industry Council and Mr. James drawing you're here online I believe.

19:25

Yes, and we have risk requested to speak on specific items. But if it's okay with you that we will just revert back to putting our hands up and invite being invited to speak as necessary rather than being introduced on to specific items. Thank you.

19:51

Now I can see there's quite a number of representatives from West Sussex County Council. Again, I will ask it's Good morning Miss Hara Do you want to introduce your colleagues or at the time as as when when you need them?

20:06

Yeah, if that's okay, we'll introduce them at the point that they need to respond to questions. We haven't registered to speak on any particular items. But we are here to respond to questions from the panel.

20:21

So are you then happy for me if we do have questions to direct them to you? And then that's absolutely fine as your colleague.

20:39

Now move on to the South Downs National Park Authority. And I believe Tony is representing Good day. Good morning, Mr. Tony.

20:48

Good morning is a rich attorney to you anyway, counsel instructed on behalf of the South Downs National Park Authority. I've got with me, Vicki Colwell, who is leading on planning matters. Robin Butcher, who is our landscape expert, Lindsay Robinson on ecology and Alex Pringle on highways. I suspect, you will probably not need to hear from all of them today, but I'll bring them in as necessary.

21:19

So as as I've said before, if I direct the questions, questions are directed to you, and then you can determine who's the most appropriate. Thank you.

21:31

If I could talk to Horsham District Council, please. who's representing Horsham today?

21:39

Plus myself, so Matthew Porter. So we're here to attend and be able to answer any questions for the panel. There's a number of colleagues on the call virtually and I'll introduce them when necessary, and you can direct any questions to me.

21:55

Now according to my list, you'd you'd have set out the areas that you do want to discuss or do you use Do you want to stick to those I've got you down as alternatives traffic and access and versus environmental matters? Or do you just want to come in as you see fit or respond to questions that we may have? You want to keep it quite open?

22:17

And it's just a case if you want to answer questions as the panel Thank you

22:27

Okay, now I'll do with this. parish councils Next I've got Nikki Hanley from Bonnie parish council morning the right hand button it should work there we go.

23:09

Yes, Nikki handily balmy parish council

23:16

and again, are you are you planning to just speak on items that as as and when they come up or?

23:21

Yes, I'd like to speak particularly on traffic, HGV and LGV routes and construction hours.

23:32

bytes of manual item three then. Okay. And any Hurst from an opposites?

23:42

I'm only Hersman chairman of town and parish council and the National Grid paths substation is in the parish of Thailand along with rampion one and UK Power Networks.

23:56

Okay, so you'll be primarily speaking on item four. Yes. Okay.

24:02

And the construction hours on Item three, police. Okay. And traffic. Thank you. Thank you very much.

24:15

So I'll then move to the statutory parties. I see that we've got representatives from national highways here today.

24:25

Good morning, sir. Thank you. My name is Sarah Marshall from national highways. And I have my colleague here Mr. Kevin Brown, who is our special planner. Thank you, sir.

24:38

Again, have you is it specifically item three, or do you wish to speak against or as you're going to as traffic and access Section? of the of it presumably or?

24:50

Thank you, sir. Is there a marshal for national highways? Yes, agenda item three, which is national highway issues, which is very broad and agenda item Five.

25:00

Thank you.

25:02

And sir just to note for the record, it's come up that my name is brown, it's bound b o w n. Kevin Baum from national highways

25:11

and the case team will have heard that and were corrected. Thank you

25:19

and I understand we've got Mr. Andrew short, who is from the National Trust is only observing today's Mr. Shaw here. Yes, you are observing thank you

25:36

again, Mr. Shaw, if you if there's an item that you feel you might wish to contribute to, if you just raise your hand at the appropriate someone will come up with a microphone. Okay. So now we're going to come to the interested parties. And I'll start with my first or the you are good morning. Yes. Cute.

26:03

you've registered speed on on most of the items for today, haven't you? So is that still you're still you wish to do that. Thank you. And Janine Crais Good morning to you. And you wish to talk about ecology?

26:19

Yeah, possibly flooding as well. But is that

26:23

in relation to item four? Presumably? Yes. Four thank you

26:40

so I have Paul light burn lightburn

26:43

ammonia Somalisa Yes, I actually wish to talk about access bit I've actually been listed down and agenda item for four three kings and moat field lane. So I'm happy to speak during item three, because I think that's most appropriate for my particular topic. Okay.

27:18

And Susan Davis, I think this morning to

27:34

you don't wish to speak does that sound sounds Oh, you do? Doesn't Okay. Thank you.

27:46

So, just a few more. Paul Reeves is online, I believe strafes.

27:57

Kate, I've read down as in attendance, so call me we'll come back to that. Mark Rennie also online store any.

28:09

Hello there. Just for observing with a special interest to Item three today. Thank you. Hey.

28:20

And David's official official is about both in person and online. So which is hit? Okay. Good morning, Mr. Fisher.

28:37

there anything, any particular item you will be answering on today?

28:43

Well, it would be item four, seven. But it's not just about the substation, it's to do with other other land issues that could be covered under four seven effects on ecology. It's an asset specific point, but it has general application across the whole across the whole route.

29:05

Well, as I said, Okay. As I said, in my opening, of course, if we're not specifically discussing your item today, we will obviously read your written representation on that because, and we may well take that forward as into subsequent hearings. So I just want you to rest assured that if we don't cover it today, it's not a unimportant topic or anything like that. Thank you. Thank you. Arnstadt mysteries is now online mysteries.

29:43

See not

29:46

okay. Is there anybody else that wishes to introduce themselves that I haven't covered already? Yes. Good

30:05

morning, Sir Robert Crawford Clark from Henry Adams, I may just wish to say something about on behalf of the client about dragons lane and under that heading, which is

30:17

344 30

30:19

days. Yes. Thank you. Thank you. Is that Yeah, Mr. Reeves, do you? Can you hear me now?

30:33

Yeah, I can't. Yeah. Can you hear me? Yes. Yeah. Apologies. That was an issue with my mic.

30:42

Mysteries. Is there any particular item on the agenda you wish to respond to questions or speak on? Thank you very much. Not at the moment. I'm hearing and listening capacity. Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Is there anybody else that I've missed off? Or who wants to introduce themselves? Now hands up in the room. Now hands up online. Oh, Mr. ballast.

31:09

I'm not sure whether I need to register to talk separately or I can just answer questions. Only in the council the ramp capacity.

31:20

Yes, you can. You can speak into any item that you wish to. It will be responding to questions today, primarily on the agenda. But yes, you can speak against whatever item you feel like so. Thank you. There's a few more matters to go through, I promise. This is a hearing not an inquiry, and therefore unless the XA have specifically requested or agreed to it, there will be no formal presentation of cases, there'll be no cross questioning of other parties. As such, any questions that you may have for other parties will need to be addressed through the examining authority. This approach is set out in Section 94 of the Planning Act, any party wish to cross question? Now, for those persons joining online, you may switch your cameras and microphones off if you're not participating specifically in the discussion. Should you wish to raise a question please raise the microphone rock soft teams hand function when invited to do so. And then switch on your camera and microphone. Please note that the chat function is disabled you will not be able to make any written comments via the chat function. They can only be made orally. But those watching the live stream please can I advise that you see at any point we break the proceedings this morning, we will have to stop the live stream recording in order to give us clear recording files. And as a result, you will need to refresh your browser in order to recommence watching. You will note from the examining authorities letter that the rule six letter that the event is being recorded and live streamed the digital recordings form a public record that contains your personal information and to which the gpd applies the general data protection regulations. Planning inspectors practice is to retain and publish these recordings for a period of five years from the secretary state's decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearings, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and therefore your consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording is given. We will only have asked for information can be placed directly on the public record that is important relevant to the planning decision. It will only be in the rarest of circumstances that we may ask you to provide personal information of the type that you'd prefer to keep private and confidential. Therefore to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, we'd ask you please to try and keep information that you do not wish to be put into the public domain to your sales and finally, during the discussion this morning, the examining authority will be note taking either in written form on the computer please do not be put off if we are typing away or or anything like that it is we are listening. And we are we will respond in due course but I just wanted to get that it can be quite off putting for that. Is there any questions? On the on what I've just said this morning before we move on to the agenda. Now hands up in the room. Now online, okay. So at last we can move on to the main items on the agenda so we can start we're gonna move on to the proposed development and alternatives

35:02

Now before I ask my we go on to this, I do want to say to parties that we have noted that there has been relevant representations made on the now adopted national policy statement. The xa, at the moment intends to discuss, to keep this as a written process for the moment. And so we will not be discussing the need for the proposed development at this hearing. As you know that deadline one includes responses to the new National Policy Statement adopted this year. And we would, as I say, prefer to read your written responses to that before deciding whether there are any questions

necessary. But I will remind parties that the merits of policy are not before this examination. And I do want to stress that to those who may not be in the know, what a national policy statement should say, or shouldn't say, what government policy should be or shouldn't be, is not this examination, we cannot, we are prevented by law from considering that we must operate within the legislative and policy framework. We cannot question the legislative and policy framework. So I do want to make that very clear that if you are responding to it, it cannot, it contains information about what it should and shouldn't say. So, just just to make that point very clear. So I'm not going to discuss the need for the developments, per se, today. But I'm going to start off asking the applicant if they could very briefly just almost set the scene, they could explain the proposed development and the application set out in various statements and application documents. I'm not looking at chapter and verse on this may be sort of 510 minutes or so maximum, please. It's so if I could ask just to explain and set out what you're applying for.

37:01

Thank you. So pull mail for the applicant. As I said at the start of each agenda item, I'll introduce the team who's likely to speak to this agenda, this agenda item. So I'll give you a brief overview of the proposed development. And then as we move into the clarification on the quantum of turbines and issues relating to substation locations, other members of the team will speak to those so I'll ask Lauren oarsmen surrounded slow Toby Lee and Tim golden to just introduce themselves so that you can identify who they are and their and their role in the project.

37:45

Darren Osmond, I work for ws P. I'm the EIA director for the project and I'm talking on behalf of the applicant.

37:55

And Andy slo on behalf of the applicant on part of the WS P environmental management and assessment team.

38:11

Sorry, Toby Lee, engineering manager for RW E and representing the applicant.

38:28

Tim Golding on behalf of the applicant, I'm a director at Goby consultants, and I am the Project Director for offshore matters. Supporting the rampion application makes it

38:46

thank you very much. So I'll give you a brief overview of the project. I will also ask one of my team to chair a couple of plans to just help illustrate the extent of the project and what's being applied for so in in high level terms, full details of the proposed development set out in chapter four of the environmental statement. Now that's document AP p 045. And that needs to be read alongside the associated figures in AP p 76. And AP p 77. Appendix four three, which is AP p one to four now, that sets out the development parameters, the draft development consent order, which I'll refer to as the DCO throughout the rest of this hearing, that p p d 009. And the works plans which comprise the offshore

works plans, p p d 004. And the onshore works plans, P E P D 005. And collectively they define the development and interact with each other to explain the extent of the consent sought. But rampion two is a proposed extension of the existing rampion offshore wind farm which I'll refer to as rampion. One which is located in the English Channel of the Sussex coastal Be it the rampion to is a completely standalone project, there is no interaction between rampion two and rampion. One as far as infrastructure is concerned rampion one was commissioned in 2018 and is located approximately 13 to 25 kilometres from the coast. It has 116 wind turbines with a blade tip height of 140 metres and a capacity of 400 megawatts. The opportunity to bid for an extension to rampion. One was opened by the Crown Estate in 2017. And an application for the extension to that project was accepted and progressed towards and awarded development rights in 2018. In addition to the extension area, which was awarded as a as a result of that process, the initial proposals to rampion to also considered the remainder of the area, which was consented but not developed as part of the Grampian one project, and an additional area, which had been subject of the agreement for lease from the Crown Estate in favour of the rampion one developer, but was not ultimately included within the order limits for rampion. One, and that that collective area, we refer to as as the remaining zone six area, because zone six was the term that was used in the round three process which resulted in the rampion one project. So the application which is now before you comprises areas, both within the extension area, and the balance of the zone six area. And that's what's being proposed. And just to help illustrate where those two areas are, I'd ask Mr. Ran to share figure 4.1 from Chapter Four of the environmental statement. And if I asked him to highlight with his mouse the extents of what is referred to as the extension area, which is the large, Western bloc, we'll find out how dexterous he is at this point. Excellent, thank you. And then the the zone six area is the area to the southeast. And the the sort of Section immediately to the north of of that area, is where the current rampion one project sits.

43:09

So I'm sorry to interrupt you just just so that I'm absolutely clear. So the area behind rampion one, the the sort of the West, the Eastern bit of the red line now, that's the area that rampion one would have been developed had it had had it had consented all its turbines. Is that is that the bit that that's the bit you're building on is that is that right if I got that right,

43:37

not in its entirety, sir. So that so that so, that area is the balance of the zone six area which comprises both the area which was consented but not built under the rampion one order, but also the area which was subject to an agreement for lease, but which was not ultimately contained within the order limits for rampion one.

44:08

If I could then ask Mr. Rahn to share graphic four one. Also from Chapter Four of the environmental statement, I'll just briefly run through the key components of of the project and this is rather a generic schematic, but it explains the principal elements that are contained within the the application. So we firstly have wind turbines located offshore. There are then a series of what are known as inter array cables, which link those turbines to an offshore substation. From the offshore substation, there is then an electricity export cable which makes It's way, onshore through an area which is referred to as the landfall towards an onshore substation. And that's that's a, that's a project specific substation. And then

there is a linkage between that substation, and the National Grid substation, which provides the interface with the electricity transmission network. So that's a high level overview of the various components to talk about, then the specific offshore infrastructure associated with this particular application. I've highlighted the area within which the project would be brought forward, and rampion to will have up to 90 wind turbines with a maximum 325 metre blade tip. We'll explain I think in other agenda items, how actually that those scenarios come forward. In terms of the operation of the parameters, marine cables will then connect those turbines as I said, to up to three offshore substations, and then up to four cables from those substations will transfer the electricity on onshore to give you an idea of the spatial extent within which within which each of those offshore elements may be constructed. Is it possible for Mr. Rand to share the key plan from the offshore works bands not sure whether in the room, we're going to be able to capture that under detail. I don't think so. I don't think it's too bad actually.

46:55

If I could just ask you to give the examination Library Reference of these plans so that those online can then upload them themselves if they wish to follow.

47:03

Absolutely So, so the offshore works plans a P E P D 004. And what we're looking at here is the key plan from that bundle of plans. So, the various components of the project comprise an array area, which is shown cross hatched on that plan, and that's the area within which the surface piercing elements may be constructed. Those comprise the wind turbines themselves, which form part of work number one is described within the draft development consent order. And also the three offshore substations which comprise work number three, a there's then an area which within which the subsea transmission cables may be constructed and those those cables are our work numbers to A to B and three B, and that area includes both the array area shown cross hatched, but also the remaining hatched area that you can that you can see there is then an area within which the electricity export cables may be constructed. Those are those are work number four, and that's the the area coloured yellow. And as you can see that that extends from the array area northwards towards towards the landfall where there are then various works associated with the landfall and bringing the export cable on shore, which fall within works number five and six as described in the DCO. And that the cable coming on shore will be will be achieved by means of horizontal direct drilling under the beach. Clamping with with that HDD being driven from from the land side, out, out into out into the sea. So, so that's, that's an overview of the offshore elements of the project. Now, as far as the onshore elements are concerned, they comprise cable circuits to be buried underground, along a route of approximately 38.8 kilometres from that landfill sites. Clem ping to the new project substation, which is proposed an open D near Cal fold. This will then connect to the existing national grid bolney substation, which is the National Grid interface with the transmission network which is located in in in mid Sussex. So, the onshore cable clumping starts within a Arun district hammer pot it crosses the boundary of the South Downs National Park and then west of Washington. It leaves the the the National Park and crosses into Horsham district where it progresses then to the onshore substation at Oak and Dean and that's wholly in portions administrative area. And from from that point, the onshore cable crosses into mid Sussex in an immediately west of the national grid, only at substation. So the principal elements of the onshore works are comprised in work number, oh, sorry, work number seven to 20 as described in shedule, one

of the draft development consent order, and the spatial extent within which each of those works and may be carried out as shown on the onshore works plans. Those those plans are P P. D. 005. They're quite lengthy. I don't intend to show them but they they illustrate the extent within each of those, those words can be carried out.

51:21

Okay, thank you. That's very helpful. I've only got a few questions to ask on just on the proposed development. I'll firstly deal with the quantum of turbines. Now, you've you I am correct in this year in saying that you could build any number between 65 and 90 the maximum is 90. But the minimum is 65. But the higher the higher tip isn't that there's that correct.

52:01

So the approach to that to the Rochdale envelope so yes, is that the project may comprise up to 9090 turbines. Now, what the approach of the Rochdale envelope does is to set parameters based on turbines that may be available on the market at the time that the development is procured? Yeah, so the approach that's been taken through the environmental assessment is to assess two turbine types one as we described as a large turbine and and one is a small, so, the way that the the DCO secures, what may be constructed is that there the maximum number of turbines is 90, but there is a constraint specified in requirement to have the draft development consent order on the maximum swept area. Yeah.

53:00

And that sorry, I'm gonna come to that. I just wanted to establish the one that is the maximum 90, but it is dependent on obviously the rotor type, the, the, and the rotor swept area, and the rotor diameter of course, I'm just going to ask you a couple of questions on that. So depending on the size of the turbine and the rotor, and the rotor diameter, there could be any number between 65 and 90, providing it doesn't exceed the 4.4 kilometres total Roseboro swept area that that's that's correct, isn't it?

53:38

That is correct. Based on the turbine types considered? Yes. Yes.

53:41

Now, you've indicated in your submissions at the pre examination procedure deadline, that it is your intention to build only one type of turbine you're not intending to have one turbine at 325 metres one at a lower height or one is going to be one design. And that's correct is now the 4.4 cut five kilometres total rotor swept area. Could you just very briefly explain to me how that figure was arrived at

54:19

it may be helpful if I look to Mr. Golden here, who's the mathematician associated with with looking at those calculations and how that's worked area is derived?

54:32

Altair, that question if that's okay. Essentially, the figure is just give you a name again just for the record sorry. So my name is Toby Lee, engineering manager. So the swept total swept area figure was

derived from the smaller number of turbines the night the 65 with the largest rotor available, which was 295 So that was slightly rounded for the DCO But that sets the swept area limit, which has been used in the application

55:10

is not constrained by the area that you've got. It's constrained by the turbine.

55:16

Essentially, yes. So yeah, what we wanted to have is a limit on the number of turbines we could put in there. So we've obviously set out a 65, large machine and a 90 of the smaller machines, and it was a way of making sure we weren't going to exceed the envelope assessed.

55:35

Yeah, what I'm trying to establish is it's not, you didn't have a starting figure of 4.5 4.5 kilometres and think, right, that's our, that's our area, you'd set that area based on the turbines that you would get. So if you had a different circumstances, you could have been asking for more or less than that number is right. Understood, thank you.

56:04

If we could just very quickly go to the DCO in question. And that we might be dipping out of the DCO here and now in advance of tomorrow. But I just wanted to look at please, very briefly where this is set out in schedule. One, part three, is page 52, I think it is. Now, you've added the words in order to in order to ensure that only one turbine design and size will be built. You've added the words in after power after the requirements to and there must be no material difference in size of the wind turbine generators. Now that contrast, in my view, a little bit from what you've actually then said in your explanatory memorandum, where you say that that the reason for that to be put in that so as PPD 11, page four, where you say that the reason for that addition, those additional wording is because it will you intend to comprise turbines of a uniform size. And I would suggest to you Mr. Mail that that your explanation doesn't match what's actually said in the DCO. And I was going to put it to you that actually the wording probably ought to be tightened. Perhaps something along the lines of the authorised project subject to paragraphs two, one and two two shall comprise of a singular wind turbine generator design height and rotor diameter. Is that something that you would be prepared to consider? Because I think the wording as it's currently drafted doesn't actually commit you to I mean, we can we can then have a debate on what material difference actually means.

58:03

Quite so. So I think what I would highlight is that I don't believe that the explanatory memorandum was actually updated at the pre examination procedural deadline, I think that document that you refer to as the changes tracker for the for the order at P P D. 11. So there's a bit of catch up work for the explanatory memo to do on this. And I agree that we can make it clearer.

58:24

Well, I think if it is your intention to have uniform sizes, designs and rotor diameters, I don't see why the DCO can't say that. And then I think that just makes it very, very clear that there will be one turbine

design based on whatever it is you get, but not exceeding the 4.4 or five kilometres rotor area. So I'll leave that with you. Finally, just on this bid, you will have seen from relevant representations from various interested parties that consider that this area isn't a very good location for turbines, it's not particularly very efficient, not very windy. What how would you how would you respond to that?

59:16

It is. So we were obviously a developer of many projects, we have identified this as a suitable project we clearly have as our web or delivered ranking one in this area, and it only operates fine

59:43

I mean, they they this isn't a any criticism or any any comment on particularly efficiency, but the suggestion that they made is that it's the North Sea area is more efficient. Is that is that the case is that it is The general comment is that it's not a suggest that this should be in the North Sea. I'm just arguing that the comments made is the North Sea is more efficient than down here is that the case doesn't make this inefficient thinking

1:00:12

efficiency is the wrong position okay? It is that the wind resource in the North Sea will be a little bit higher than it is in the English Channel.

1:00:25

So it gives you certain that when what was when resorts in the North Sea

1:00:29

is available, Wynn Resorts in the North Sea will be a little bit higher, higher on the Wynn Resorts in the English Channel. Thank you.

1:00:45

Okay, that's all the questions I had on the proposed development. I'm going to come on to alternatives in just a second. Does anybody want to raise anything that I that we've just been discussing? Mr. Tony,

1:01:02

rich attorney for the South Downs National Park Authority. I just wanted to clarify, Mr. Miles introduction, he referred to the cable route leaving the national park to the west of Washington. I think it's worth emphasising that that is just for a very short space, and it then re enters the National Park, immediately to the east of Washington, and continues through there until it crosses out at a later point. So it was just that clarification, I don't think there's going to be a dispute on it.

1:01:49

Um, happy to check that point. CERN. Well, parallel confirm.

1:01:52

Thank you.

1:01:59

Hello. Yes, ma'am. As to California, the rampion. It was just about the point that you asked about efficiency. My understanding is that several of the relevant representation actually have gone into some detail to look at the comparison and rampion one's actual output with what the stated output would be. And I wonder if there's anything to be said about that at this point.

1:02:24

Do you want to respond to that point? I'm sure you'll be making written representations anyway. or responding to written representations Anyway, on that?

1:02:34

I think we'll deal with that in writing. So I think okay, well, the easiest way to deal with that. Okay,

1:02:39

so there'll be making so when those points are made in more detail by the parties that have made them the app per week, and then all of a see what the applicants for responses to that will be. Thank you. So I'm going to move on to alternatives. I don't have too many questions here. I just want to go through the National Grid substation connection choice, briefly and then a few questions on other matters, including the substation at Oak and Dane. I just want to remind the public whether when we do reach that point, I'm only asking questions on the alternatives, the actual perceived effects, or actual effects from the choice of science, we will deal with later in the agenda. So I just want to deal with a few matters here. So I want to just ask a few questions, if I may, please, on the choice of the national grid connection point. It may be helpful to bring up map 3.4 At this point from the ES Chapter Three a PPO 75 If you have that two hands

1:03:59

it is the one with a black line, a blue line and a red line and various colour lines on it. But yeah, that's it. Yeah. So for the purpose of this this conversation I've limited to the discussion on the national grid substations where there is sufficient capacity to cater for the price of homes that's the ones with 1200 megawatts and they are at I believe at a folly and little hole state and I'm gonna just wants to call a few questions on each. Now could the applicant just very briefly explained to me or summarise why Farley which I believe is the dotted yellow line on you might not be able to see it on that on that plan. It's the sort of dotted yellow line why that was discounted.

1:04:55

Darren Osmond WSOP on behalf of the applicant, and I will start With the folly option, which is the option that you are you rightly correctly said is located in Hampshire, approximately 80 kilometres to the west of Barney, and it's on the bank of Southampton water. So folly you're correct in saying would have been able to accommodate the 1200 megawatt capacity. But this option would also require a very long marine cable, which would which would come with higher risk level of unthinned seabed issues and general construction risk. And the marine cables would also require significant preparation activities and costs for both the clearance and unexploded ordinance clearance, particularly in this area due to historic UX. So levels in and around Southampton and Portsmouth. This option would also have significant issues with shipping and navigation through the Soylent and Southampton water, which

experiences very high levels of shipping and other marine traffic. And so these factors significantly constrained the site and added significant costs to construction. There were also environmental constraints associated with this site, both marine and land based. And so therefore, for these reasons, and the options appraisal study that was undertaken, showed that the additional costs and the logistical constraints would render the overall project not economically viable.

1:06:24

Thank you. In terms of the construction challenges that you talked about, and the length of the cable, can I just be clarified? Obviously, it's a much longer distance between the proposed array and and Farley. is the length of the cable a challenge? Or is that it's not to do with that it's just to do with the construction you have on the way. So we're not talking you're not you didn't discount it because it was longer than going in at clipping Beach, that that wasn't an issue. It was purely the challenges along the way.

1:07:01

There has been WSOP on behalf of the applicant, and the marine cables being longer presents significant additional costs that the applicant In addition, the significant preparation activities in this area in particular also brings significant return and significant

1:07:16

when I ask a question on costs in just a moment, but just in terms of in terms of there's no set distance of a cable length in the on the seabed? It can be if it needs to be 50 kilometres it is 50 kilometres is I'm just trying to establish there wasn't so it's over 50 therefore can't be used. Yeah, there was no measure.

1:07:42

Yeah, case, there's there's two technologies to look at here. So we've gone for an AC solution. And typically you can get a circuit of over sort of 8090 kilometres to work over that distance. After that point, you potentially looking at moving to another technology, which is high voltage DC. Yeah. Which we've not applied for.

1:08:03

Thank you. But the the distance between the proposed site and Farley is less than 90 kilometres, isn't it? Yes. Yeah. Thank you. Now.

1:08:20

You referred to significant issues with shipping, which I don't think anybody disputes we know that it's an important shipping area. But does that is that not insurmountable? I mean, is could you have not constructed a cable route? Where there is shipping? It? Presumably they could have been overcome? Or was it an automatic issue of note we can't interrupt shipping lanes.

1:08:50

Or it has been WSOP on behalf of the African shipping and navigation issues, as I said in this area are significant which is which brings with it significant constraints logistically and presents potential delays and adds additional costs to construction.

1:09:08

Yeah, I've been trying to get as what what what constraints? What what, because you're going under you're going under the seabed? How would you be obstructing shipping lanes

1:09:23

and building on behalf of the applicant. A lot of the issues will relate to the amount of obstruction and displacement of activities during construction. So because the cables would need to run all the way up the Solons as a very busy shipping area as we've discussed, and therefore there would be substantial impacts upon activities related to the ports of Southampton and Portsmouth. due to construction activities and the safety zones etc around those vessels whilst the construction activities were ongoing. And that's not just the cable laying, but all of the preparation works beforehand. So it's a substantial obstacle to overcome in order to develop a cable along those line.

1:10:19

Thank you. He mentioned costs. I think you said I think from what I read that this to go at Foley would have been 200 million pounds additional cost to do that. How much was this financial cost weighed in the overall benefits of dispensing the scheme, given that the funding statement says that the project cost is going to be around 3 billion pounds? And 200 million sounds pretty insignificant if you've got a 3 billion pounds scheme, doesn't it? Reminding you, of course, that the Farley, National Grid substation, I would have required no, I assume onshore works, other than to build your own your own substation, they would have been no cable route would there. And it would have voided the South Downs national park as well.

1:11:22

But one mask is to what extent was the 200 million the deciding factor here

1:11:28

miles to the applicant, I think I don't think it was a determinative factor in itself. If I can put it in those terms, we're clearly dealing with a basket of effects here and constraints. And it was those issues that were considered in the round by the project team and in in deciding not to, not to pursue that option. In terms of overall cost considerations. Also, the applicant is mindful about delivering an economic project, which is which is capable of being promoted through the various sort of contract for different assortment process and ultimately, ultimately delivered. And costs are a consideration for that.

1:12:21

Thank you. And you just pause One moment please.

1:12:37

Okay, just because I'm conscious of the time and the agenda, I'm going to I'll probably do with any issues with little hosted on as written questions now. And I had a question about the land forward clumping, and the cable routes that Mr. Griffith said yesterday, the MP. So I will defer those to written questions. I think they were more clarification questions. Anyway. I will just ask you a few

questions if I may about or first of all, before I come to the substation winding Lane North does anybody wants to ask any questions about Farley and the what we just talked about?

1:13:23

So Richard, attorney for the National Park Authority, I just want to emphasise that in the context of alternatives here, because there's a question of avoidance of the National Park, I just want to emphasise the highest threshold of exceptionality. And when you come on to consider the detail of that justification that's been given by the applicant for choosing a route through the National Park. It's a high threshold that they have to cross it's not just purely cost. They have to show an economic impediment. And at the moment, we think you'll need more information to be satisfied that a route through the National Park is necessary.

1:14:08

Did you want to respond to that?

1:14:11

Only briefly said to emphasise that when it comes to identification of group connection points, there are effectively two processes involved here. There's the applicants appraisal exercise, which has just been referred to there's also the the national Gridcoin process which actually follows a slightly separate process and both the result of both of those processes ended up with the conclusion that the connection point was was a bony.

1:14:37

Thank you. I think it would be helpful to me and if as an action point, you could perhaps prepare a short perhaps expanding statement on my phone he was discounted it I read into your section on chapter three, that this appeared to be a largely financial decision. That may not be the case you, as Mr. Tony said explained to there may be other matters that you can demonstrate, but it seemed to me what appeared to me that this was a largely financial decision. And given that it avoided the national parks Afghans National Park, it would have required no onshore cabling. I would like perhaps a further explanation if that can be provided as to exactly why that that substation was was discounted, as I said, Little horsted would have required going through the National Park. And I appreciate your your disk, you've written submissions on that, that that substation wasn't planned at the time you were doing your work. So they'll leave those questioning for now, but I think Mr. Toney, you'll have, I think we get that extra information from them, though that would probably be quite helpful. Thank you. So again, if I could just very quickly move on to the substation opening. And as I say, we're going to talk about the actual site itself in a moment. But again, I would just ask the applicant one question here, please. Why number nine north the site immediately above the existing national grid substation was a contender for the I believe are the sub proposed substation until as parties and others said yesterday as recently as October 2022, when it was moved to the current proposed site. Now, I would just again, a brief explanation please wine and Lane North why it was discounted, and the preferred option given to the proposed site, particularly given Miss Smith's comments yesterday that you already had a lot of surveyed information about wind and Lane north you had the a lot of it there, it seems from for her point of view, and others the more sensible location, why was it discounted what what were the factors?

1:17:12

Thank you, Andy slow on behalf of the applicant. So the winding Lane North site and the oak Indian site were included in the first statutory consultation so included as options in the preliminary environmental information report. Following the output of this exercise, the two sites were reviewed in detail from a multidisciplinary perspective in a series of workshops held to inform this, we, the engineering team produced concept engineering layouts to provide further detailed consideration of how the site's could meet the engineering technical requirements. And these we also use to consider the potential impacts and allow development of achievable embedded environmental measures. So the decision was informed by considering the constraints in the round and driven by three main factors. From an engineering and technical delivery perspective. Open Dean, and one lane north were compared, while in lane North was overall a more confined space on the site, which would not have provided the required design flexibility in the early stages of the project's development. Secondly, the narrow shape of the space would have presented significant challenges to the installation and maintenance of the electrical equipment potentially putting the ability of certifying the site as a compliance substation at risk. And so there's a couple of the engineering points on maybe move over to the second point is landowner involvement. So engagement had identified that a large proportion of the wind in the name site was subject to potential developments which were entering the planning stage. So firstly, there was an agreement between more than that landowner with Welsh power for grid stability infrastructure on the site. This had been subject to EIA screening with mid Sussex District Council at the time of the site selection that was planning reference, DM 214285. And secondly, engagement identified that land on the eastern half of the site would be subject to a planning application for a battery energy storage system. This was subject to screening at the time of site selection in around following the statutory consultation exercise. That app sorry screening references dm 20 20807. And this scheme subsequent couldn't leave came forward in March 20. See, 23 is the one planet battery storage scheme. That's application reference dm 230769.

1:20:08

Sorry, can I just sort of summarise what you've been saying then? So the wind Lane North site, as far as you're concerned, was too confined to space. It's narrow shape was not sufficient for your needs. And it was also subject to interest for other development. Is that Yes, I

1:20:27

believe that nutshell, an agreement with one landowner, particularly with regards the Welsh power criticality scheme. And there were some further points on the environmental side of things. If you want

1:20:41

me to go through a combination of of of factors, just on terms of the size of the site, compared to the proposed site, is there a material difference between the two?

1:20:53

I think, overall, there is greater space available availability at Open D.

1:21:01

Do you know the hectares you know, the site area between the two? I think

1:21:05

I can clarify that after the break just in terms of the overall site, hectare edge. But the I think the main point is, from an engineering perspective, this site ran East West was quite thin and constrained with regard to meeting those engineering requirements. Okay.

1:21:25

Okay, thank you. Does anybody wants to comment respond to that, Mr. Smith first?

1:21:33

Hello. Well, with regards to the engineering, you said that you need nine hectares, and that site is bigger than that. So that doesn't follow I'm afraid. With regards to the landowner involvement, none of those things have yet been consented. And in any case, they had you could have at the end of the day, just compulsory, purchase them. But that would have cost more, you didn't in any way take into account the landowner at at Oak and Dean and his plans to do a development there for the benefit of the community, which he abandoned after, after your attack on open deemed really the environmental measures, and you just haven't specified enough the engineering constraints that you've considered you don't anywhere say what they are, you don't compare. And and I don't think you'd actually probably done the flood, you hadn't understood how confine flood, you hadn't taken into account the cable that lies under there, you hadn't taken into account that the fact that more engineering would need to be done to actually access off the road, whereas there is a perfectly good wind lane to access from that way, the other way. And you hadn't actually done many of the ecology studies, you knew that the ecology studies were largely desktop, the ones that you had done, you hadn't completed many of them, or they weren't inadequate, that they weren't adequate. And so you couldn't use have used those to adequately compare the two sites. Okay,

1:23:21

thank you. I think as would it be helpful. I think if we could have again, a perhaps a dozen action points, a further statement on the engineering constraints. If you could expand upon that for the one blind, the one on the site place, if that could be perhaps a further explanation. I think we'd all we'd all welcome that. I'm going to come here first to Bob only parish council, and then I'll come down. Thank you.

1:23:46

Thank you very much. Nikki Hanley, Chair of barley parish council. Just to add to what the applicant has already said. This one um, Lane north side was the alternative site in the rampion. One project and was rejected then based largely on land owner issues, and also environmental issues as well. The whole the length of one of the three fields is adjacent to an ancient woodland. There was also a very comprehensive archaeological survey carried out by rampion in the first project, and there was significant finds within one of the fields that forms part of the one lane project. On top of that, what Bonnie parish council would say on the alternates is that the UK government's National Risk Register identifies substations as terrorist targets. And there are already three substations in adjacent fields off one lane, and that adding a fourth would create a problem for local residents and landowners. And that was something that, that Bonnie felt very strongly about, on top of the fact that we've also put up with six years of construction already. Thank you.

1:24:56

Thank you, if I bring counsel in near West Sussex County Council now see we have a hand up online and then I'll ask the applicant to provide a response

1:25:12

on the SATs West Sussex County Council historic environments, just wanted to briefly raise that the alternative chapter ap 044, assess the overall environmental effects for both Canadian and windblown north as equivalent. But the Historic Environment effects are significantly higher for the OIC Indian sites due to the harm on listed building. I just wanted to draw attention to the requirements of section 66 of the Planning Act and feel that that was given insufficient consideration and consideration alternatives.

1:25:48

Thank you very much.

1:25:52

Yep, thanks. So this is just say, Poor for written submissions will be advocating in our local impact report, that there should be a better presentation of the evidence of the Italian alternative testing. Particularly suggestion to have the brag appraisal and appendix. Thank you.

1:26:14

can zap can want to respond to what you've just heard?

1:26:19

And, yes, I think just in terms of the the status of the winding lane, North site and the developer interest, I think we'd say the site had an overall increased likelihood of requiring compulsory acquisition based on the status of the land agreements at the time. And without this land, it wouldn't be impossible to proceed with the substation site. And when considering the potential developments, or indeed there was some landowner engagement at the time. And it was considered that there was a possibility of avoiding compulsory acquisition acquisition at the age Indian site is subject to the further landowner agreements and those schemes referred to or not represented in the planning system. At present. Yeah, the and just note that discussions have been ongoing since the site selection and have now progressed to the point with the OIC Indian land known as last week that there was an exchange of contracts on a voluntary agreement for that site.

1:27:26

Thank you. Okay, I'm going to draw that bit of the agenda then, to close if I could just go through the action points. I think there are only 2am i right. There's a four. Okay, with the Army keeping. Can we just run through the action points, please?

1:27:47

Thank you. So I'm happy to say I've also got for the first one was the request to make it clear within the draft development consent order and and the explanatory memo that we're dealing with one type of turbine here. Secondly, there was a point around, I said, I confirm in relation to Mr. Tony's point about

the route reentering the National Park, west of Washington. Thirdly, you asked for a paper explaining the reasons why fully was just counted as as as a connection point. And then lastly, a submission explaining the engineering constraints at the wind online site.

1:28:34

I've also got down one point about applicant's response in detail as to the level of wind resource in the channel as a response.

1:28:46

Happy to add that Okay, thank

1:28:47

you. Thank you. Okay.

1:28:52

This is Paul Lightbourne. So, before you leave the alternatives, may I raise a point this the grid connection point at dungeon s right on the coasts was dismissed in the applicant documentation. Without any meaningful evaluation based on it was close to an decommissioning nuclear power station. There is now a big move to move all grid connection cables offshore there's a cable being run down from offshore and proposed offshore wind complex of Aberdeen down to the Yorkshire coast, it will be a DC connection. The applicant seems to be pre occupied with an onshore solution using a C to a substation at Oak and Dean which would not be necessary if they use the more convenient grid connection point. I'd like to just raise four kids To duration because it's it's not shown on the options map. It was mentioned in documentation that dungeon s as a close to coast gridpoint would avoid all onshore cables, it would avoid crossing the National Park. And this is an alternative that was not given due consideration in the in the auctioneering documentation. Thank you.

1:30:24

Do you want to respond to that? Either now in writing,

1:30:28

I'm quite happy perhaps. So just to add it to the list of things that will respond in writing to certainly, certainly it was considered, and we can explain the reasons why that was not taken. taken forward.

1:30:41

I think I'd be interested in that response. And yes, I think so. Yes, if you would be. Thank you. I would like to take a break at this point. Mr. Smith, as he said something else you want to add?

1:30:54

Sorry, only to follow on to that question to ask them for more information about design and engineering. Can we also is it possible also to include the environmental considerations and how they actually came to that conclusion? Because we don't believe that enough. Information was actually available to them at the time. And some of the information they had they've ignored and actually overall that their decision was that there was a marginal preference. Okay.

1:31:26

I believe the applicants heard that and will provide a quite a robust response as to why I'm also interested why wine and Lane was was discounted in that way. But I have heard Bonferroni parish Council's response as well. So I think that's all been very, very helpful. So I think that will take a 15 minute break. happy with that. So let's let's just come back just after quarter past 11. Please will then resume with item three on the agenda.